CASES REPORTED THIS WEEK.

In the Weekly Reporter.

Allcock v. Merrybent and Darlington Railway Co. 180
Birmingham and District Land Co. v. London and North-Western Railway Co. 173
Edison Electric Light Co. v. Jablochkoff Electricity Co. 176
Henley, in the Goods of 184
Jessey v. Mackintosh 181
Jones, In re, Zincraft's Will Trusts 172
Marine Insurance Co. v. China Transpacific Steamship Co. 169
M'Myn, In re, Lightbown v. M'Myn 179
Peters v. Tilly 183
Roberts, In re, Kiff v. Roberts 176
Thomas v. Turner 177
Williams, In re, Davies v. Williams 182

The Solicitors' Journal and Reporter.

LONDON, JANUARY 8, 1887.

CURRENT TOPICS.

THE CAUSE LISTS of the Court of Appeal shew 158 final and 31 interlocutory appeals, making a total of 189 appeals, as against 249 appeals at the same time last year, and 204 appeals at the last Michaelmas Sittings. The Chancery Division lists shew an unusually heavy total of 820 causes and matters for hearing, as against 675 at the same time last year, and 795 at the last Michaelmas Sittings.

A CIRCULAR has been issued by the Council of the Incorporated Law Society stating that "The Bar Committee and the Council of the Incorporated Law Society have had under consideration the practice adopted by some barristers' clerks of soliciting and pressing for payment of clerks' fees in excess of those regulated and allowed by the R. S. C., 1883. The Bar Committee and the council concur in the opinion that the rules instituted for the guidance of the profession in this respect by the proper authorities, and for the public good, ought to be adhered to. The Bar Committee have, by resolution, requested the members of the bar to call their clerks' attention to the matter."

MR. JUSTICE STIRLING, sitting as Vacation Judge in the Queen's Bench Chambers, has introduced what we may believe may described as an innovation in the practice, by refusing to grant applications *ex parte* for receivers in ordinary cases and requiring a summons to be issued. His reason for taking this course is, no doubt, the intimation recently given by the Court of Appeal on the subject. In delivering judgment in *Peperno* v. *Harmston* on the 16th of December last, Lord Justice LINDLEY remarked that "A receiver ought not to be granted *ex parte*, except in cases of extreme emergency, and he had never known a case that rendered an *ex parte* order for the appointment of a receiver necessary." And we believe that a similar expression of opinion occurred in another case before the Court of Appeal. We hope that the innovation of the Vacation Judge will be continued by his successors in chambers. The practice on the common law side as to granting orders for the appointment of a receiver by way of equitable execution has become very lax, and it may be doubted whether the discretion intended to be exercised by, and specially reserved to the judge, in granting such applications, by R. S. C., 1883, L., 15a, has been always exercised. We believe that in some cases the costs of obtaining the receiver order and completing the receiver's security by recognizance thereunder have exceeded the original judgment debt. In others, the plaintiff has been appointed receiver, without security, to receive property largely in excess of his judgment debt, subjecting the defendant to serious prejudice and possible loss. It has also been the practice (on the common law side) to grant receiver orders over contingent and reversionary interests, when, undoubtedly, the sounder practice—also initiated, we believe, by the present vacation judge—is to grant orders over property of that class by way of "charge" only, and so avoid costs being incurred in settling security, &c., for what is at the moment, if granted, a mere dry receivership. We think that the rule of court above referred to sufficiently shews that powers of equitable execution were not intended to be exercised except in cases where the judgment debt is sufficiently large to justify this expensive procedure, and the property sought to be charged in execution is not only of a fitting character, but likely to satisfy a reasonable proportion of the debt; and we venture to suggest that stronger evidence than some vague allegation to the effect "that there are insufficient goods to satisfy a common execution" should be required.

THE RATHER COMIC INCIDENT reported from New South Wales of a chief justice who resigned office after a three days' tenure because his appointment was "distasteful to the two senior members of the bench," and as to the other member of the bench, "not only distasteful, but so wholly unjustifiable as to have led to the utterance by him" of very unpleasant expressions, has become still more diverting since the publication of letters from those members of the bench, intimating, as regards two of them, not only that they loved their three days' chief justice, but had taken great pains to shew their friendship for him; and, as regards the third, that, although he thought the appointment "a grave mistake," he had "driven with him [the three days' judge] to the Criminal Court"; had "shaken him by the hand," and had intimated that his opinion as to the appointment would not be allowed to make any difference in his bearing to the Chief Justice as a colleague. Either the Chief Justice must have been more sensitive than the ordinary run of his brethren in other countries or there must be something not yet made public to account for the incident. Everyone must remember the episodes in Ireland when a learned Lord Justice took frequent opportunities of attacking the Lord Chancellor—once, at least, while sitting with him on the bench—the "explanatory speeches" by the Lord Chancellor and the "acceptance" by the Lord Justice of the "explanation of the Lord Chancellor." There seems to be a somewhat similar judicial character across the Atlantic, of whom we have seen it occasionally recorded in the American law journals that he has been "humping his back" (we think that is the phrase employed) against his brother judges. In this country, as regards the Queen's Bench Division, in which High Court judges have to sit together, the possibility of the occurrence of "humping" is, to a great extent, obviated by the reference to the Lord Chief Justice, which is understood to occur before the appointment of a new judge of that division. Probably the veto of the chief of the court would be sufficient, in most cases, to prevent an appointment which would be decidedly distasteful to the majority of the bench. Whether this is so or not, the arrangement has its advantages, as it, at all events, enables the Lord Chancellor to obtain information as to the qualifications of the proposed judge, and we think it is matter of some regret that there is at present no member of the Chancery bench to whom, from his official position, a similar reference can be made. This is one of the evils attending the transference of the holder of the office of Master of the Rolls from the Chancery Division to the Court of Appeal.

WORD COMPETITIONS are so very much in vogue just now that it may be worth while to consider what is the legal position of the competitors, and of those to whom the winners look for prizes. It seems probable that the contract to give the prize is absolutely void, and that the prize, if won, could not be recovered at law. By 8 & 9 Vict. c. 109, s. 18, all contracts or agreements, whether by parol or in writing, by way of gaming or wagering, are null and void, and no suit may be maintained for any sum of money alleged to be won upon any wager, "or which shall have been deposited in the hands of any person to abide the event on which any wager shall have been made." It might, perhaps, be thought that there is too much skill in the "word competitions" for them to be subject to this enactment, but such does not appear to be the law upon the authorities. A wager is defined in *Johnson* v. *Lansley* (12 C. B. 468), to be a contract to pay according as some uncertain contingency should happen; and an agreement to walk a match for £200 a side, *Diggle* v. *Higgs* (25 W. R. 777, 2 Ex. D. 422), and a deposit of a sum of money by each of two persons in the hands of a stakeholder to be paid to one or the other according as a horse does or does not trot eighteen miles in one hour, *Batson* v. *Newman* (25 W. R. 85, 1 C. P. D. 573), have been held to be wagering contracts within the section. A proviso, indeed, exempts any agreement to contribute a sum of money to be awarded to the winner of any lawful game, sport, pastime, or exercise, but this proviso was

held in *Diggle* v. *Higgs* not to apply to cases where the competitors only subscribed, and it seems also to be limited to physical exercises. The contributors, therefore, to word competitions rely only on the honour of the persons who offer the prizes.

THERE IS A very valuable article by Judge CHALMERS in the current number of the *Law Quarterly Review*, on the county court system. It represents the conclusions of a keen observer, familiar with constructive legislation, and especially with rules as to practice and procedure, derived from the experience of over two years' tenure of the office of judge of one of the most important county court circuits in the country. As might be expected, the article is singularly impartial, terse, and practical. It deals, in the course of about a dozen pages, with the whole subject of the defects and anomalies of the existing system, and whether we do or do not agree with the suggestions made for their remedy, we are bound to admit that they are usually well considered and supported by cogent reasons. Dealing first with the subject of the arrangement of circuits, Mr. CHALMERS points out, what everyone must admit, that reform is urgently needed in this respect. The circuits require revision with reference to Bradshaw and the shifting of populations into large towns. The amount of travelling required from many judges involves a serious loss of judicial time, which means loss both of public money and suitors' money also. Passing next to the question of jurisdiction, he draws attention to the inconvenience arising from the rule that the defendant must reside, or some part of the cause of action must arise, within the district of the court where the plaint is filed, and suggests that there should be some power of transfer within the same circuit, to be exercised upon terms. He also points out the anomalies which exist as to the pecuniary limit and subject-matter of jurisdiction, and advocates the adoption of Lord BRAMWELL'S suggestion that the plaintiff might bring any action for any amount in the county court, but that the defendant might, as of right, remove it into the High Court, if the sum claimed or interest involved exceeded a specified amount, different amounts being specified in different classes of business if thought necessary. In combatting the apprehension that such a change would remove the business of the High Court wholesale to the county courts, he is, we think, unfair to solicitors as a body. He says, "It is the solicitor, and not the lay client, who chooses the tribunal in ninety-nine cases out of a hundred. As long as solicitors' costs are higher in the High Court than in the county court, an action will not be brought in the county court without some cogent reason for doing so." We do not believe that this motive operates to anything like the extent which Mr. CHALMERS supposes. We do not pretend that solicitors differ from every other class of professional men in disliking to work for inadequate fees, but we think we are entitled, from some considerable knowledge of the ways of country solicitors, to say that, as a body, they take a broad and enlightened view of their own interest. Their success in the long run depends on their securing for their clients a speedy and inexpensive settlement of their controversies, and if this could be insured by proceeding in the county court in heavy matters, such proceedings would be taken. But there is a consideration, which Mr. CHALMERS altogether overlooks, which we think would be sufficient to prevent these matters from being voluntarily brought before county courts. What is the use of getting a speedy and inexpensive decision in the first instance if an appeal is inevitable? And, without intending any imputation on county court judges, we imagine that the defeated party, in cases involving large amounts, would usually appeal.

WITH REGARD to county court procedure, Mr. CHALMERS advocates the personal service of the initial summons on the defendant in all cases where leave for substituted service has not been given; that a jury should only be demanded as of right where the sum claimed exceeds £20, but that the court should have power to order any case to be tried with a jury; that where the claim exceeds £20 there should be pleadings as in the High Court, or, at any rate, a statement of defence; and, lastly, that the imperfect procedure corresponding to order 14 should be remedied by a provision that the plaintiff should be entitled to judgment unless the defendant, within twelve days after service, files an affidavit disclosing some *primâ facie* ground of defence, and that the registrar should then have power to deal with the matter as if it were an application under order 14, an appeal to the judge being given. With regard to the officers of the courts, he suggests that the judges ought not to be compelled to pay deputies out of their own pockets; that they might usefully be enabled to exercise the powers of stipendiary magistrates within their districts; and that they might well be asked to attend the assizes and take such cases as the High Court judge thought proper to relegate to them. With regard to the registrars, he adduces forcible reasons for suggesting that their salaries (at all events, in small courts) ought not to be dependent on the number of plaints. He says that one registrar told him that "by making the tallymen who sued in his court prove their cases strictly, he had diminished his income by nearly a fourth." This is a matter which demands the attention of the authorities. Mr. CHALMERS also suggests that the registrars should have power to dispose of all undefended cases, and defended cases where the amount claimed does not exceed £2, unless one of the parties requires the matter to be adjourned before the judge. On all these matters, and many others, we must refer our readers to the article for the reasons given in support of the writer's views, but we cannot forbear giving one or two quaint incidental remarks illustrating the experience of a county court judge. Thus we learn that "his misery reaches a climax when two women choose to go to law about some article of female attire. Each party insists on cross-examining the judge instead of her opponent, and diversifies the proceedings by making furious attacks on the moral character of the other lady"; that "a party in person has very little chance with a jury against a moderately skilful advocate, *unless, indeed, that party happens to be a good-looking woman*"; and that juries "do substantial justice between the parties. They have a marvellous faculty for scenting out a fraud. Why a jury should be better than a judge in this respect I cannot say, but I am sure of the fact. I do not accept the cynical legal explanation that, however novel a fraud may appear to the lawyers, there is certain to be one man on the jury who has attempted or committed a similar fraud himself." Mr. CHALMERS concludes with a well-deserved compliment to Mr. NICHOL, the superintendent of county courts, in which we can heartily concur. We could supply many instances within our own knowledge, shewing that the administrative working of the system is watched over with a vigilance and tact which are often sadly wanting in other branches of our legal system.

DURING THE ARGUMENT of a recent case in the Court of Appeal counsel proposed to cite a decision of the Railway Commissioners, reported in Neville and Macnamara's reports, and approved of by the Court of Session in Scotland. The Court, however, said that, with the greatest respect for the Railway Commissioners, they must refuse to allow their decisions to be cited, though, of course, counsel might cite any decision of the Court of Session. Is not this somewhat pedantic?

EASEMENTS ATTACHED TO THE REVERSION.

EASEMENTS are incorporeal rights, and are, from their very nature, necessarily imposed upon *corporeal* property. The exercise of the right is an interference in some way with the complete and absolute ownership of a corporeal hereditament. But is it equally clear that the dominant tenement, or the property in respect of which the right is enjoyed, must be of a corporeal nature? In the vast majority of cases it undoubtedly is land or houses the owners of which possess these privileges which are called easements; but, as a matter of law, is it absolutely necessary that this should be the case? Is it possible, in other words, to attach an easement to an incorporeal hereditament? This has never, we believe, been expressly decided, but in the recent case to which we are about to refer a very curious doctrine was laid down, which seems to practically involve a decision in the affirmative.

In *Lord Dynevor* v. *Tennant* (34 W. R. 737, 32 Ch. D. 375; on appeal, 34 W. R. 777, 33 Ch. D. 420) a right of way granted by a lessee to his lessors over the demised premises seems to have been

considered, at all events in the court of first instance, as appurtenant, not to adjoining lands of the lessors, but to the reversion expectant on the determination of the lease. This may appear, stated thus curtly, to be somewhat absurd; but, unless the absurdity be swallowed, the decision, we are inclined to think, can with difficulty be supported. The following is an outline of the facts of the case.

The Neath Abbey Estate was in the year 1820 held in undivided thirds, one of which belonged to the then Lord Dynevor in fee, another to a Mr. Compton in fee, while the remaining third was subject to a settlement under which the tenants for life had leasing powers. The co-owners in that year granted a lease for 1,000 years to Henry Tennant of a strip of land, part of the estate, for the purpose of making a canal which was afterwards made. The lease contained a proviso that nothing therein contained should prevent or hinder the said lessors (naming them), their heirs or assigns, from using all or any of the land or ground thereby demised, or intended so to be, or any stream or streams of water flowing over or through the same, or from granting any wayleaves or roads over or across the same for the carriage of coal, goods, wares, or merchandises, or for any other purpose or purposes whatsoever, in like manner as they could or might have used the same in case the lease had not been granted, but so, nevertheless, as not to prejudice or injure the said canal, or the navigation thereof, or any road or towing path, work or works, which should or might be made or constructed for the use or convenience of the same. In the year 1838 the co-owners of the three undivided shares of the Neath Abbey Estate made partition, which was effected in the usual way by a conveyance to a grantee to uses to hold to the use of the three co-owners in severalty, the parcels being set out in three schedules. Their was this peculiarity in the arrangement of the parcels, that a portion of the canal was allotted to Mr. Compton at the apportioned rent, while the land along the entire length of both its banks was allotted to the other co-owners. The whole of the land on one side, and part of that on the other side of the canal were included in Lord Dynevor's schedule, who thus became entitled to an estate in fee simple in a certain portion of the estate intersected by the canal, the canal being vested in Tennant for a term of 1,000 years, and subject thereto in Compton in fee simple. In March, 1839, Compton conveyed to the lessees of the canal the reversion in fee in that part of the canal which had been allotted to him by the partition deed, and thereupon the term of years in that part of the canal became merged by operation of law. Lord Dynevor, the tenant for life of the lands comprised in the first and third schedules to the partition deed, wishing to re-unite the severed portions of his estate by a bridge, took preliminary steps for that purpose. This proceeding was opposed by the owners of the canal, and then the present action was instituted claiming a declaration of right and an injunction.

It was assumed, both by Mr. Justice Pearson and by the Court of Appeal, that the proviso above set forth operated as a re-grant by the lessee of a right or easement of crossing the canal by means of a bridge, yet it was held in both courts, though on somewhat different grounds, that the easement had come to an end, and that Lord Dynevor was not entitled to the relief which he claimed. The reasoning of Mr. Justice Pearson may be summarized as follows:—The easement depends entirely for its existence on the grant which creates it. If granted for a certain duration, when that time has elapsed the grant is gone. When the grant is contained in a lease it cannot endure longer than the lease "unless there be some equity in a third person to keep it alive," and, therefore, when the lease was merged by the conveyance of the fee to the lessee the easement became extinct. Then, examining the terms of the partition deed, he finds it impossible to spell out any contract on the part of the reversionary owner of the canal "that he would do no act which should interfere with the existence of the lease, so as to preserve alive all the rights which the lessee had granted to the original reversioners." This treatment of the question evidently assumes that the reversion on the lease was the dominant tenement, and that, subject to an equity arising by contract, the lessor and lessee could agree to extinguish the easement as well as the term. For if a lessee were to grant a right of way to the owner of adjoining land for the residue of his term, it seems plain that the easement so created could never, during the time originally limited for its duration, be extinguished by any act *of the lessee*. Whether the term was merged or surrendered, the easement would continue as a legal right appurtenant to the dominant tenement affecting the land formerly comprised in the lease. The learned judge does not indeed, in terms, state that the reversion was to be regarded as the dominant tenement; but, if not, the easement must have been attached to the adjoining lands of the then co-owners, and then the partition deed, as it conveyed those lands, with their appurtenances, to Lord Dynevor in severalty, would have placed him in the position of an adjoining owner entitled to an easement over the canal for the residue of the 1,000 years, not merely during the actual continuance of the lease.

The view taken by the Court of Appeal, though leading to the same conclusion, differed wholly from that expressed by Mr. Justice Pearson. "In my opinion," said Lord Justice Cotton, "the purchase of the reversion from Compton would not have affected any right or easement vested in Lord Dynevor, if held by him in respect of his land. But the question is, What is the real effect of the demise, whether it is a re-grant of an easement to the lessors in their capacities of owners of the land adjoining the canal, or as landlords and owners of the reversion? Now to me it is obvious that this reservation or re-grant was intended to be for the benefit of the owners of the adjoining land; but it is a very different thing to say that it was granted to them as such owners, and not as landlords." And later on he says that "the best way of giving effect to the proviso is to hold that it is a re-grant to the lessors, not as owners of the adjoining lands, but as owners of the reversion." We must admit that we find this language in the highest degree perplexing, for the Lord Justice, by asserting that the re-grant was for the benefit of the adjoining lands, constitutes them the dominant tenement, and yet, by importing the consideration of the twofold character of the persons to whom the re-grant was made, he seems to consider that the transaction created only a personal right, and not an easement in the proper legal sense of the term. If the decision is to be supported, we think that it must be on the ground that, according to the construction of the proviso in the lease, no easement was created, but the parties *contracted* for a certain benefit to the adjoining lands. We do not, however, find it possible to force the language of the Lord Justice into this meaning, for he not only uses the word "easement," which is a term of art, as a description of the subject-matter of the grant, but he refers, towards the end of his judgment, to the possibility of the lessors, after they had parted with the adjoining lands, granting liberty to the owners for the time being of those lands "to make use of the right re-granted by the demise." This is, perhaps, the most incomprehensible of the learned judge's utterances, for if the right were granted in gross, it could not be assigned (*Ackroyd* v. *Smith*, 10 C. B. 164), and, if it were appurtenant to the adjoining lands, it could be exercised by the owners of such lands without licence from anyone.

We have referred at length to *Lord Dynevor* v. *Tennant* because it is the only case in which the possibility of attaching an easement to a reversion as the dominant tenement has been so much as suggested. In our opinion such an attempted annexation is a violation of the fundamental conceptions of real property law, and also (a consideration of at least equal weight) of common sense. This is manifest if we consider that an easement is a present right while a reversion is a future estate. But we must not conclude that all kinds of incorporeal hereditaments, technically so called, are equally debarred from the privilege of having easements appurtenant to them, as the following passage from Mr. Gale's valuable work will suffice to shew:—"There appears to be," he says, "no authority for saying that an easement may not be claimed as accessory to an incorporeal hereditament, as, for instance, if the owner of a right to take certain minerals under close A. obtained a grant from the owner of an adjacent close B. of a way over close B., or a right to discharge water over it for him his heirs and assigns as appurtenant to the right of mining; it is believed that an easement would be created, and would be appurtenant to the incorporeal right already vested in the grantee." Whether this be so or not, it is clear that the owner of a mining licence is in a very different position from a person having only a reversionary estate, and differs only in name from a lessee of the mines. The true test seems to be that laid down by Coke, that the possibility of attaching an easement to an incorporeal hereditament depends entirely on "the propriety of relation between principal and adjunct."

UNQUALIFIED PERSONS.

THE encroachments of unqualified persons on the business of the qualified practitioner is found by solicitors in some districts to have become very serious, more particularly during the present general depression. In many places the greater part of the county court work is now done by debt collectors. The unfortunate creditors who place themselves in the hands of such persons instead of going to the trained and properly-qualified solicitor, over whom the court and the Law Society have some control, find out their mistake when it is too late. They begin to see their folly when they cannot get the amounts recovered out of the hands of their "agents," their only remedy being by means of an action, to bring which they have to employ a solicitor. The consequence is that the amount of the debt, and very often more, is swallowed up in costs. Had they gone in the first instance to a solicitor, they would, in most cases, have received their money immediately on its recovery; and in the very exceptional cases in which they would not, a complaint to the Law Society would very likely end in the solicitor paying up rather than have his conduct brought to the notice of the court. In the latter event the client would, of course, lose his money; but he would at least have the satisfaction of having the person who defrauded him punished, while, in the case of the "agent," the unfortunate creditor often obtains neither his money nor any satisfaction for the loss of it.

The principal offender is the debt collector, who arms himself with an instrument vulgarly known as a "penny frightener"—a document usually printed on blue paper, bearing the royal arms, and headed with the words "In the County Court" in large letters. The effect of this document is that, unless A. pays to B. an amount which is alleged to be due to C., B. (the debt collector) will take proceedings for its recovery. There is nothing on the face of the document to show that B. is not a solicitor, and, as the "penny frighteners" are usually addressed to poor and ignorant people who do not know what a county court summons is like, they imagine that they are issued from the county court, and they become so terrified that they not only pay the amount of the debt, but the costs also. Documents of this description, although they do not look like county court summonses or solicitors' letters, render the unqualified person sending them liable to a penalty of £10 for each offence under the 12th section of the Solicitors Act, 1874 (37 & 38 Vict. c. 68). There are other letters written by these agents on plain paper to the same effect, but with no indication on the face of them what the profession or business of the writer is, and these also bring the writer within the penal section above referred to.

After the debt collectors come the "agents" who prepare deeds and other documents for reward. The 60th section of the Stamp Act, 1870 (33 & 34 Vict. c. 97), renders an unqualified person liable to a penalty of £50 if "for, or in expectation of, . . . gain or reward he draws or prepares any instrument relating to real or personal estate or any proceedings in law or equity." The term "instrument" in the section does not include wills or other testamentary instruments, agreements under hand only, letters or powers of attorney, or transfers of stock containing no trust or limitation. The practice of unqualified persons preparing agreements and wills is very extensive, and nothing can be done to stop it. It is, however, not the less pernicious because it is legal, as may be seen from the number of actions which arise upon the construction of such documents. The practice of preparing deeds could, to a certain extent, be stopped if the Commissioners of Inland Revenue would only exercise a little more activity, but we have for a long time looked in vain for cases of prosecutions by them under the section referred to.

In connection with these matters we wish to refer to the practice by solicitors of allowing a commission to unqualified persons on work introduced by them. In the few remarks we propose to make it may be convenient to deal with the matter under the following heads:—

1. Solicitors entering into agreements with unqualified persons to share profits.
2. Solicitors lending their names to unqualified persons on payment of a salary, the unqualified person taking the profits.
3. Commission by solicitors to their clerks on specific matters of business introduced by them.
4. Solicitors granting a share of their profits, should there be any over a certain amount, to their clerks.
5. Unqualified persons acting in the names of solicitors without their knowledge or authority.
6. English solicitors granting agency to Scotch, Irish, and Colonial solicitors.
7. Solicitors to building societies and public companies receiving a salary and paying over to the societies the costs recovered.

1. The most serious offence of this kind is where a solicitor enters into an agreement with an unqualified person for the purpose of carrying on business together and sharing the profits, which is clearly an infringement of the 32nd section of the Solicitors Act, 1843 (6 & 7 Vict. c. 73). This section provides that if any solicitor shall act as agent in any action in any court for any person not duly qualified to act as a solicitor, or permit or suffer his name to be in any way made use of in any such action or matter upon the account or for the profit of any unqualified person, or send any process to such unqualified person or do any act thereby to enable such unqualified person to appear, act, or practise in any respect as a solicitor, in such case the solicitor shall be struck off the roll and for ever after disabled from practising, and the court may commit the unqualified person to prison for any term not exceeding one year.

In these cases it is very difficult to obtain evidence of the illegal agreement unless the parties quarrel as to the division of the profits or some person who has a knowledge of the agreement gives information to the Law Society, in which case that body would, we believe, as a matter of course, bring the conduct of the parties to the notice of the court. The Law Society has already proceeded in several cases of this kind, with the result of having the solicitor struck off the roll (to which, under the section, he can never be restored) and the unqualified person committed to prison for contempt of court. These agreements are, we understand, not infrequently entered into, and we think it may be fairly said that any person who knows of such a case ought to make it his duty to communicate it to the Law Society. The mischief done by such "firms" is very great, both to the reputation and standing of the profession and the pockets of the unfortunate clients.

2. Not less reprehensible, and quite as difficult to prove, is the very frequent case of an unqualified person getting hold of an impecunious solicitor and paying him a small sum per week for the use of his name. All the work is done in the name of the solicitor, and the unqualified person takes all the profits, and if, as is often the case, the arrangement leaks out, the latter poses as the clerk of the former, and, as long as they hold together, it is almost impossible to bring them to justice. It is quite clear to us that this case also comes within the 32nd section of the Act of 1843 already referred to.

3. Next comes the question of a clerk introducing to his employer a specific matter of business on which he receives a commission of one-half or one-third, as the case may be. This seems to us to be also an infringement of the 32nd section. It might, however, be argued that this is not an infringement of the law, as the clerk exercises no control over the litigation; but there seems to be ground for saying that in a case of this kind the solicitor allows his name to be used for the profit of an unqualified person.

4. Widely different is the practice of some firms of solicitors of dividing their profits, if there be any beyond a certain amount, proportionately between the partners and the clerks. This gives the clerks an inducement to perform their duties diligently and to attend assiduously to the interests of their employers without giving them any direct interest in the business, and it does not appear to us that there is anything illegal in the practice.

5. The cases of unqualified persons carrying on actions in the names of solicitors without their knowledge or authority are not infrequent. The remedy in this case is contained in the 26th section of the Act of 1860 (23 & 24 Vict. c. 127), which provides that any unqualified person who acts in the manner described shall be guilty of a contempt of court and may be punished accordingly, and, in addition he renders himself liable to a penalty of £50 for each offence. Proceedings under this section are taken by the Law Society, with the sanction of the Attorney-General; and that body has been successful in the prosecution of some of the offenders under this section.

6. The question of English solicitors conducting business for Scotch, Irish, and Colonial solicitors on agency terms is not so important; but it has recently occupied the attention of a good many solicitors, as nearly all Scotch, Irish, and Colonial solicitors now expect agency. Some of the more eminent firms refuse to allow it, as there is no doubt that it is irregular, and in consequence of this refusal the business has been taken away from them and given to other firms who allow agency. For all practical purposes such solicitors are unqualified persons as far as practising in England is concerned, except, perhaps, in the case of Colonial appeals, in which case the Colonial solicitor is entitled to follow his appeal. In the latter case it is presumed that agency could, without impropriety, be allowed.

7. The case of building societies and public companies employing a solicitor at a fixed salary, all the costs received by him for work done for the society or company going into the funds of such society or company is somewhat analogous. We assume, however, that these cases are governed by *Galloway and the Corporation of London* (15 W.R. 1032, 4 Eq. 90), in which it was held that an agreement between the Corporation of London and a solicitor should be paid a fixed salary to be clear of all expenses of his office and to include all emoluments, he paying to the corporation any surplus which may arise of receipts over payments is not opposed to the provisions of the Solicitors Acts nor to the policy of the law where it is also part of the agreement that the solicitor is not to transact professional

business for any other client. If such appointments are governed by this case, it seems that there is nothing illegal in the arrangement. We know that the solicitors to railway companies are nearly all now appointed on the footing of a fixed salary, they not being allowed to do any other business and any costs received by them going to the funds of the company. In the case of building societies the only question which presents itself, and which raises a doubt in our minds, is that the costs recovered may be very much larger than the salary paid, and the building society might thus make a profit out of the appointment.

SOME RECENT PRACTICE DECISIONS.

In *Martin* v. *Spicer* (34 W. R. 589, 32 Ch. D. 592) we have a case of some importance on the practice under R. S. C., 1883, ord. 31, r. 1, with regard to applications for leave to deliver interrogatories. The effect of the decision is to render the practice in the Chancery Division with regard to applications for leave to deliver interrogatories uniform with the practice in the Queen's Bench Division. *Hall* v. *Liardet* (W. N., 1883, p. 194)—a case in the Queen's Bench Division—decided that, on applications for leave to deliver interrogatories, the judge would not consider the relevancy of particular interrogatories, and, on the authority of this case, the practice in the Queen's Bench Division has been regarded as settled. In the Chancery Division, however, the practice appears to have been doubtful. The decision of Vice-Chancellor Bacon in *Martin* v. *Spicer*, following the decision in *Swabey* v. *Dovey* (34 W. R. 510, 32 Ch. D. 352) seems to set the matter at rest. In *Martin* v. *Spicer* the learned judge expressed his opinion that the rule to be followed was that laid down by Mr. Justice Field in *Hall* v. *Liardet*; that it is no part of the duty of the judge or the chief clerk to decide upon the relevancy or irrelevancy of specific interrogatories, and allow or disallow them accordingly; and that all that is necessary is for the applicant to state, not necessarily in writing, the general nature and scope of his proposed interrogatories.

The decision of Vice-Chancellor Bacon in *Lhonheux, Linon, & Co.* v. *The Hong Kong and Shanghai Banking Corporation* (34 W. R. 753) seems more open to criticism. In this case the plaintiffs were a Belgian firm, and the defendants were a foreign corporation having an agency in London. The action was in respect of a contract made abroad and alleged to have been broken abroad. The writ having been served upon the manager of the defendants' agency in London, the defendants moved to have the service set aside. The service, however, was held to be good under ord. 9, r. 8. This rule provides that in the absence of statutory provisions "every writ of summons issued against a corporation aggregate may be served on the mayor or other head officer, or on the town clerk, clerk, treasurer, or secretary of such corporation." Although there is plenty of authority for placing a liberal construction on this rule, it certainly seems to be a strained interpretation to hold that it applies to the English agent of a foreign firm. It is not easy, moreover, to reconcile this decision with the case of *Nutter & Co.* v. *Messageries Maritimes de France* (54 L. J. Q. B. 527), where service on the London agent of a foreign firm was set aside.

In *The Dartmouth Harbour Commissioners* v. *The Mayor of Dartmouth* (34 W. R. 774) the judge in chambers had ordered that the plaintiffs, who were a corporation incorporated by a private Act of Parliament, should give security for costs on the ground that a receiver of their property had been appointed by the court. The order, however, was set aside by the Divisional Court. This decision is in accordance with the old-established rule and with the recent authorities on the subject. It has recently been held that security for costs will not be required to be given by a plaintiff who sues in bankruptcy, even where he is in insolvent circumstances (*Cowell* v. *Taylor*, 31 Ch. D. 34); and that the fact that a plaintiff is insolvent and that there is a receiver of his assets is not necessarily a ground for requiring him to give security for costs (*Rhodes* v. *Dawson*, 34 W. R. 240, 16 Q. B. D. 548).

On the 30th ult., at the Worship-street Police Court, in the course of a summons under the Married Women (Maintenance in Case of Desertion) Act, 1886, Mr. Bushby decided that the Act was retrospective, the words applying to "any married woman who shall have been deserted."

A tablet is to be placed on the old Gate-house at Lincoln's-inn. A petition was presented by some of the members of Lincoln's-inn to the benchers, asking them to preserve from the destruction threatened by the rebuilding operations then going on the old Gate-house of Lincoln's-inn fronting Chancery-lane and the adjoining chambers southward. That request having been complied with, the Society of Acts have now obtained leave to place on the house a tablet directing the public to the residence in the time of the Commonwealth of Mr. Secretary Thurloe.

REVIEWS.

MERCANTILE AGREEMENTS.

THE INTERPRETATION OF MERCANTILE AGREEMENTS. By JOHN DENNISTOUN WOOD, Barrister-at-Law. Stevens & Sons.

Questions of interpretation occupy a considerable place in practice. One would have thought, *à priori*, that the same blunder would not recur, but, so far from this being the case, we find that it recurs over and over again. There are two objects in collecting cases on interpretation—first, we may shew that a word or phrase which may bear more than one meaning, always bears a particular meaning in a document of a certain nature, unless such meaning is rebutted by the context; secondly, we may shew that a word or phrase A., which may mean B. and C., occurring in an instrument of a certain nature, must mean B. if the phrase D. occurs in the same instrument. Rules of either nature are of use to the practitioner as shortening his work, as in the absence of such rules he would always have to revert to first principles.

This book contains rules of interpretation of either class, and rules of law expressed in a manner which will be useful to those who, either as lawyers or merchants, are concerned with mercantile documents. The fault of the book is an occasional looseness, hardly amounting to inaccuracy, of statement. The title is, perhaps, to a slight degree misleading, as the author discusses rules of law as well as rules of interpretation properly so called; this is, however, one of the difficulties inherent to the subject, for, as has often been stated, there is a strong tendency in rules of interpretation to become rules of law; add to which that many of the rules of interpretation discussed in this book would be unintelligible without the antecedent discussion of certain rules of law.

The author "has endeavoured from a decision, or series of decisions, to deduce a general rule of law. . . . If the rule . . . can be readily understood without any illustration, and is clearly deducible from the authorities cited in the footnote referred to in the text, he has added nothing to the statement of the rule and the citation of the authorities. Frequently, however, the meaning of the rule would not readily be apprehended unless an example of it were given, and in such cases he has appended one or more examples of the rule." We confess that on reading these words we were filled with a horrible misgiving; it appeared as if the author had confounded rules of *law* with rules of *interpretation*. A somewhat careful perusal of the book has convinced us that this is not the case.

The general rules of law as to the application of intrinsic and extrinsic evidence to ascertain the meanings of the words employed are stated at pp. 2 and 5. The author has done meritorious work in his enunciation of these rules; the more so as he has avoided a pitfall into which many lawyers of eminence, even judges, have fallen, when they say that "extrinsic evidence cannot be applied to determine the meanings unless there is a latent ambiguity." People who use this language have not grasped the great truth that almost every word in the language may bear more than one meaning, and that, if we wish to ascertain in which of these meanings the writer used his words, we must endeavour to put ourselves into his place—in other words, we must adduce evidence of his circumstances. The manner in which Mr. Wood discusses these rules shews that he understands the principles of his subject.

A good example of the merits and the demerits of the book will be found in the description of the different meanings of "representation" as used in questions arising on marine policies and fire policies, on questions arising on ordinary mercantile agreements, and on questions arising on agreements for the sale of land, family settlements, and some other non-mercantile agreements (pp. 36, 94, 199). The discussion of these meanings is very good, but when the author embodies part of his conclusions in a rule he says:—"Whether words are to be interpreted as amounting to a representation, a condition, or a warranty, does not depend on any formal arrangement of the words, but upon the intention of the parties to be collected from the whole agreement, and a consideration of the circumstances under which it was made." The rule as thus stated lays down the rule for the application (1) of *intrinsic* evidence; (2) of *extrinsic* evidence to the interpretation of the document in question. While the former rule is correctly stated, the latter rule is so stated that a person not conversant with the subject might be misled. We are not at liberty to consider the circumstances for the purpose of seeing whether it is more or less likely that the parties intended a representation, condition, or warranty, but for the purpose of seeing what was the meaning in which the words must have been used—in other words, what is the intention that is expressed? It is fair to say that the author understands the distinction here pointed out; our objection is only to the manner in which he has expressed his meaning.

A part of this work which will be of great value to the practitioner is the appendices, which contain a glossary of "words and expressions used in, or in connection with, questions arising upon mercantile agreements, the meaning of which has been defined by

judicial decisions or in words of authority," and a collection of mercantile usages. Notwithstanding the criticisms that we have made, we are of opinion that those of our readers who have to construe mercantile agreements will do well to peruse this book.

PRIVATE BILL LEGISLATION.

A History of Private Bill Legislation. Vol. II. By Frederick Clifford, Barrister-at-Law. Butterworths.

We have now before us the second and concluding volume of this work, and a portly volume it is, of nearly 1,000 pages. The subject with which the book deals is one of the utmost interest and importance, and it is not too high praise to say that the book is worthy of its subject. The future historian of the "Victorian Era" will find here ready to his hand a vast collection of facts and figures, and the form in which these are presented is attractive as well as instructive.

The present volume falls naturally into two divisions, of which the first deals with certain of the greater subjects of Private Bill Legislation which were not discussed in the first volume, and the second contains an historical exposition of practice in connection with such legislation. After a chapter relating to Highways, Roads, Bridges, and Ferries, we come to three chapters containing the history of the legislation with respect to the London Water Supply, including an account of the abortive attempts of 1880 and 1884 to put this matter on a new basis. Then several chapters are devoted to the subject of Local Authorities, one of them being specially appropriated to the Corporation of the City of London. Materials are supplied here for tracing out the history of the much-debated coal duties; the benefits which have accrued to the public from their existence are explained, and it is pointed out that, in the event of the thirteenpenny tax not being renewed in 1889, the corporation's prescriptive right to metage will then again arise. Chapters are also given to the subjects of Insurance and of the Thames Docks.

The second division of this volume is occupied, as already stated, with the consideration of the practice, the historical development of which is fully worked out, and the present system is discussed. Various proposals, recent and comparatively old, for the delegation of the work of the Private Bill Committees to judicial, local, or other bodies are investigated, and the conclusion at which the author arrives may be best stated in his own language:—"Committees do a most useful and necessary work without payment. This work is part of the legislative functions of the High Court to which they belong, performed, it may almost be said, in the presence of Parliament, and subject to immediate check and revision from either branch of the Legislature. Committees are no more infallible than Parliament itself is. But suitors trust them, recognize their competence, and are satisfied with a right of appeal and a second hearing. The interests of suitors, however, are small in comparison with the public interests affected by this jurisdiction. For the Imperial Parliament to discontinue its ancient Parliamentary tribunals, now reformed and cheapened, and delegate legislative functions, wholly or partially, to any inferior authority, would surely be a lamentable abandonment both of power and of duty."

ROMAN PRIVATE LAW.

Institutes and History of Roman Private Law. By Dr. Carl Salkowski. Translated in full and edited by E. E. Whitfield, M.A., of Oriel College, Oxford, member of the Incorporated Law Society. Stevens & Haynes.

The translator's preface to this book contains the following somewhat enigmatical sentence:—"In studying Roman law I had found that best progress could be made through use of German treatises. That now published in English represents what may be the fifth edition of a book which is recommended by the Oxford Board of Legal Studies." If this means that the book now before us is recommended by the Oxford Board of Legal Studies, we should rather dissent from their recommendation. It consists, in the form now before us (and we must premise that we have not compared the translation with the German original, so that we are unable to say what is due to author and what to translator), of a series of excerpts from the Institutes, Digests, and Codes, arranged in groups and interspersed with introductory and explanatory paragraphs. Now it is true that neither the Digest nor the Institutes are arranged in a very scientific manner, and in reading them one skips about from one head of law to another in a rather distressing manner; nevertheless the consecutive paragraphs cannot be safely dissociated always, even where the immediate relation is not very apparent, without producing confusion; and Dr. Salkowski, or his translator, has used the scissors so unsparingly that it is rare to find very many lines of the original text in consecutive order. An example will give a better idea of the nature of the book than any amount of description. We take, at haphazard, the definition of *Injuria* at p. 668:—

"*Injuria*, in the narrower sense, is every intentional and illegal violation of honour—*i.e.*, the whole personality of another," and this definition is illustrated by the following passages:—

"*Generaliter injuria dicitur omne quod non jure fit; specialiter alias contumelia, quæ a contemnendo dicta est, . . . alias culpa, . . . sicut lege Aquilia damnum injuria accipitur, alias iniquitas vel injustitia.*"

"*Injuria ex affectu facientis consistit. Itaque pati quis injuriam, etiamsi non sentiat, potest; facere nemo, nisi qui scit se injuriam facere, etiamsi nesciat, cui faciat.*"

Now, we think that it would be far more instructive, more interesting, and more intelligible for the average student, who wanted to understand the meaning of *injuria* in Roman law, to sit down and read Digest 47, 10, which would not take him very long, than a series of clippings like the foregoing. The example above, however, is more intelligible and readable than a good many which we have come across, but which are too long for quotation. One of the most curious results of the clipping process which we have found is on page 665, where the following passage occurs under the description of the action for *Damnum Injuria Datum*, given by the Lex Aquilia:—"*In heredem vel ceteros haec actio non dabitur, cum sit pœnalis, nisi forte ex damno locupletior heres factus sit.*" After reading which, if the student is not duly impressed with the logical beauty of Roman law we do not know what will impress him.

TRADE AND FINANCE ANNUAL.

Barker's Trade and Finance Annual, 1886-7. Effingham Wilson.

A considerable amount of information is here collected, in a moderate compass and in a readable shape, on a large variety of topics. The first section of the book, which is devoted to the Money Market, deals with such matters as the Bank of England, the price of gold, financial panics, and so on. The Silver Question has a section to itself, in which bimetallism and the purchasing power of the rupee find a place. Foreign Exchanges and the Stock Exchange are also discussed, and a mass of statistics is presented bearing upon English, American, and Indian railways, and the commercial staples of wool, iron, coal, tin, copper, lead, petroleum, and tea, as well as on population. But the most important and, from a legal point of view, the most interesting topic comprised in the work is the English Land Question, followed by some details on the agricultural industries. Upon the English Land Question the elementary materials necessary for forming a judgment appear to be supplied, and are, on the whole, fairly stated. The weakness of the theories as to "unearned increment" is made clear by the authority of the late Professor Fawcett, and the objections to Mr. Jesse Collings' Allotments and Small Holdings Bill are forcibly stated. With respect to the movement for the so-called enfranchisement of leaseholds the judgment of the compilers appear to be in suspense; they do not appear to see the full force of the objections to transferring one man's property to another by enabling the present leaseholder to insist on compulsorily purchasing the freehold reversion at a price arbitrarily fixed by some external authority, nor to be fully alive to the very different positions which would be created if any law in this direction were confined to future leases, in which case people would be able to act with their eyes open, and there would not be the same reason for complaint.

ARCHITECTURAL DISPUTES.

The Consulting Architect: Practical Notes on Administrative Difficulties and Disputes. By Robert Kerr, Architect. John Murray.

"The purpose of this book," says the author's short preface, "is to exhibit, on practical and almost popular ground, the principles upon which the architect, as an expert, has to deal with the various classes of difficulties and disputes connected with building affairs," and it can hardly fail to be of great use to those for whom it is intended, dealing, as it does, with all the important matters in which the assistance of the consulting architect is likely to be invoked, and giving throughout sound, practical information and advice. The author modestly reminds his readers that he is not a lawyer, but the nature of his subject inevitably leads him to discuss many points in which legal considerations are involved, and we may say that his practical experience has enabled him to give on such points counsel of which no lawyer need be ashamed. Wholesome and, as experience

shews, not altogether unnecessary, suggestions as to caution in making affidavits and giving *viva voce* evidence are made, and while the advice here given on the various points discussed will not enable the consulting architect to dispense with the exercise of his own powers of thought and work, yet, if in the multifarious cases which may arise, he exercises those powers in the spirit here suggested for his adoption, the value of his assistance ought to be great, and his opinions ought to be capable of standing the tests of the court or the arbitration room.

CORRESPONDENCE.

THE LAW'S DELAY.

[*To the Editor of the Solicitors' Journal.*]

Sir,—We venture to call attention through your columns to the following facts, which seem to us to point to something radically wrong in the arrangements for the administration of justice:—

In a trust for which we are the solicitors there is a question on the construction of a will, and the decision of the court was desired upon the point. Some of the beneficiaries, therefore, took out an originating summons, returnable in the early part of *May last*, in chambers. One affidavit verifying the facts was read, and the matter was adjourned into court. The case was at once inserted in the list, classes II. and III., and *is still awaiting hearing*.

It is right to mention that the judge to whose court the case was originally attached died, and another judge took it over, with others, but, even allowing a delay of three weeks for the transfer, we think this instance of delay—simply, it would appear, by reason of want of judge power—is a disgrace to our civilization. There are other cases in the same predicament, and it seems to us that to get over it (and avoid similar blocks in future) there should be more judges.

It would be infinitely better for one judge, or even two, to be idle for a short time each sittings than to impose upon suitors such unconscionable delay.

Our case, when it *does* come on, will not, we suppose, occupy more than half-an-hour, yet it has been standing in the list *ready for hearing since May last*.

SOLICITORS TO THE TRUSTEES.

LAW SOCIETIES.

HULL INCORPORATED LAW SOCIETY.

The annual meeting of this society was held on the 22nd of December in the hall of the society, Lincoln's-inn-buildings, Bowlalley-lane. The president, Mr. J. J. Thorney, occupied the chair, and there was a large attendance of members. The president moved, and Mr. T. Priestman (vice-president) seconded, the adoption of the report, which had been printed and distributed amongst the members. The report shewed that there were now 92 members of the society, and that was the largest number the society ever contained. It dealt with the action of the council with respect to the several Bills which had been introduced into Parliament affecting the interest of the profession and the public, and reviewed the effect of some important and unexpected decisions of the courts of appeal in reference to mortgages, bills of sale, and the appointment of a receiver. Regret was expressed at the difficulties placed by the authorities in the way of improving the practice and the procedure, and so extending the usefulness, of the Borough Court of Record, and concluded with a reference to the proceedings at the annual provincial meeting of the Incorporated Law Society of the United Kingdom at York in October last, on the occasion of the centenary of the Yorkshire Law Society, which Mr. Thorney, Mr. Priestman, Mr. J. T. Woodhouse, Sir Albert Rollit, and Mr. C. F. Shackles attended from the Hull Law Society. A vote of thanks having been passed to the retiring officers and council was acknowledged by Mr. Thorney; on the motion of Mr. J. Travis-Cook, seconded by Mr. Birks, a special vote of thanks was recorded to the retiring secretary, Mr. J. T. Woodhouse, for his valuable services to the society in that capacity for eight years; and in acknowledging the vote Mr. Woodhouse expressed his satisfaction that the society was now in such a prosperous condition. Since he first took office the number of members had, by the efforts of successive presidents, and by the increasing advantages the society offered, doubled; it had become incorporated, had a habitation and premises of its own, and a very valuable and much improved library; it had exercised considerable influence on the proceedings of the chief society in London, and done very valuable work for the profession locally. The officers and council appointed for the ensuing year were as follows:—President, Mr. T. Priestman; vice-president, Mr. J. T. Woodhouse; hon. secretary, Mr. H. C. Lambert; hon. treasurer, Mr. J. Allen Jackson; who, together with the following, form the council:—Mr. J. K. Thorney (ex-president), Mr. E. Laverack, Mr. H. Birks, Mr. A. M. Jackson, Mr. John Travis-Cook, Mr. T. Farrell, and Sir Albert Rollit, M.P. The auditors re-elected were Messrs. C. E. Gresham and R. H. Winter. The meeting then proceeded to discuss several motions, of which notice had been given, relating to matters of professional interest.

LEGAL NEWS.

APPOINTMENTS.

Mr. John Bradley Dyne, barrister, has been appointed Conveyancing Counsel to the Treasury in succession to the Hon. Robert Collier, who has succeeded to the peerage as second Lord Monkswell. Mr. Dyne is the eldest son of the Rev. John Bradley Dyne, D.D., formerly head master of Highgate School, and was born in 1839. He was educated at Eton, and he was formerly fellow of King's College, Cambridge. He obtained the Bell Scholarship in 1860, and he graduated in the first class of the classical tripos in 1863. He was called to the bar at Lincoln's-inn in Michaelmas Term, 1866, and practices in the Chancery Division. Mr. Dyne was tutor in the law of real and personal property at the Inns of Court from 1873 till 1876.

Mr. Charles Frederick Gill, barrister, has been appointed Junior Prosecuting Counsel to the Post Office at the Central Criminal Court, in succession to Mr. Ernest Baggallay, M.P., who becomes senior counsel. Mr. Gill is the eldest son of Mr. Charles Gill, of Clapham, and was born in 1851. He was called to the bar at the Middle Temple in Easter Term, 1874, and he is a member of the South-Eastern Circuit.

Mr. William Charles Cripps, solicitor, of Tunbridge Wells, has been appointed Clerk to the Tunbridge Wells Local Board. Mr. Cripps was admitted a solicitor in 1877.

Mr. William Arnold Statham, barrister, has been appointed Prosecuting Counsel to the Mint for the East Riding of Yorkshire, in succession to Mr. Francis Joseph Coltman, resigned. Mr. Statham is the eldest son of the Rev. William Mann Statham, and was born in 1859. He was educated at University College, London, and he graduated B.A. at the University of London in 1877. He was called to the bar at the Inner Temple in January, 1883, and he practices on the North-Eastern Circuit and at the East Riding and Hull Sessions.

Mr. John Carey Hall, barrister, has been appointed to act as Assistant Judge of Her Majesty's Court for Japan. Mr. Hall is the second son of Mr. John Hall, of Portrush, Antrim. He is a B.A. of the Queen's University in Ireland, and he was called to the bar at the Middle Temple in June, 1881.

Mr. Baden Henry Powell, C.I.E., of the Bengal Civil Service, has been appointed Judge of the Chief Court of the Punjaub.

Mr. Charles Grant Logan, barrister, has been appointed to act as Registrar of the Supreme Court at Penang. Mr. Logan is the eldest son of Mr. Abraham Logan, of Singapore. He was educated at the University of Edinburgh, and he was called to the bar at the Middle Temple in January, 1883.

Mr. Frederick Nassau Molesworth, solicitor, of Rochdale and Littleworth, has been elected Coroner for the Rochdale District of Lancashire in succession to his father, the late Mr. John Molesworth. Mr. F. N. Molesworth had been for several years deputy coroner for the district. He was admitted a solicitor in 1873.

Mr. H. C. Lambert (of the firm of J. & T. W. Hearfield & Lambert) has been elected Honorary Secretary of the Hull Incorporated Law Society.

Mr. William Mills, solicitor (of the firm of Messrs. Frederick Kent & Co., of 105, Cheapside), of 56, Camberwell-road, S.E., has been appointed a Commissioner to Administer Oaths in the Supreme Court of Judicature.

Mr. Thomas Robson, solicitor, of Pocklington, has been appointed Clerk to the magistrates of the Holme Beacon and Wilton Beacon Divisions of the East Riding of Yorkshire (the petty sessions being held at Market Weighton and Pocklington), Mr. Holtby, of York, who has held the appointment for many years, having resigned.

PARTNERSHIPS DISSOLVED.

Charles Anthony Branson, John Newton Coombe, and George Ernest Branson, solicitors (Branson, Son, & Coombe), Sheffield. Dec. 31.

George Hodson Burnham and William James Henry, solicitors (Burnham & Henry), Wellingborough. Dec. 31.

Robert Glassford Lawson and Joseph Stoyle Coppock, solicitors, 3, Mount-street, Manchester. The said Robert Glassford Lawson will in future practice at 12, Tib-lane, Cross-street, and the said Joseph Stoyle Coppock at 18, St. Ann-street, Manchester. Dec. 25.

Theed William Pearse, James Pearse, and Charles Bailey Halliley, solicitors (Pearse, Pearse, & Halliley), Bedford. Mr. T. W. Pearse will carry on business at the Shirehall, Bedford, Mr. J. Pearse at the County Court Office, Saint Paul's-square, Bedford, and Mr. C. B. Halliley at No. 2, Saint Paul's-square, Bedford. Dec. 31.

Robert Sankey, Herbert Tritton Sankey, Rest William Flint, and Percy Edward Sankey, solicitors (Sankey, Flint, & Sankey), Canterbury,

Margate, and Ramsgate. The said business in Canterbury will in future be carried on by Robert Sankey, Herbert Tritton Sankey, and Rest William Flint, and the said businesses at Margate and Ramsgate will in future be carried on by Percy Edward Sankey. Dec. 31.

[*Gazette*, Jan. 4.]

COURT PAPERS.

SUPREME COURT OF JUDICATURE.

ROTA OF REGISTRARS IN ATTENDANCE ON

Date.	Appeal Court No. 1.	Appeal Court No. 2.	Mr. Justice Kay.	Mr. Justice Chitty.
Mon., Jan. 10	Mr. Ward	Mr. King	Mr. Jackson	Mr. Pemberton
Tuesday ... 11	King	Ward	Koe	Clowes
Wednesday 12	Clowes	King	Jackson	Pemberton
Thursday .. 13	Pemberton	Ward	Koe	Clowes
Fri., Jan.... 14	Koe	King	Jackson	Pemberton
Saturday... 15	Jackson	Ward	Koe	Clowes

	Mr. Justice North.	Mr. Justice Stirling.	Mr. Justice Kekewich.
Monday, January ... 10	Mr. Beal	Mr. Leach	Mr. Carrington
Tuesday ... 11	Pugh	Godfrey	Lavie
Wednesday ... 12	Beal	Leach	Carrington
Thursday ... 13	Pugh	Godfrey	Lavie
Friday ... 14	Beal	Leach	Carrington
Saturday ... 15	Pugh	Godfrey	Lavie

TRINITY SITTINGS, 1887.

HIGH COURT OF JUSTICE.

CHANCERY DIVISION.

Chancery Court, I.

Mr. Justice KAY.

Mond., Feb. 21 } Tusdy. ....22 } Wednesday 23 } Thursday ..24 } General paper
Friday ....25..Mots. adj sumns, & gen pa
Saturdy....26 } Sht causes, pets., adj sums. & gen pa
Monday ....28 } Tuesdy, Mar 1 } Wed.... ... 2 } Thursday ... 3 } General paper.
Friday, ... 4...Mtns, adj smns, and gen pa
Sat,..... 5 } Sht causes, pets, adj sums, & gen pa
Monday .... 7 } Tuesday .... 8 } Wednesday 9 } Thursday ...10 } General paper
Friday ....11...Mots., adj. sums, & gen pa
Saturday ..12 } Sht causes, pets., adj sums, & gen. pa
Mon.,.....14 } Tues. .....15 } Wednesday 16 } Thursday ...17 } General paper
Friday ....18...Motns adj sums, & gen. pa
Saturday ..19 } Sht causes, pets., adj sums, & gen. pa
Monday ....21 } Tues. .....22 } Wed. .....23 } Thurs ....24 } General paper
Friday ....25...Mts, adj sms & gen pa.
Satrdy ....26 } Sht. caus., pets., adj sums, & gen. pa.
Monday, ..28 } Tuesday.....29 } Wednesday 30 } Thursday ...31 } General paper
Friday, Apr 1..Mots, adj smns, & gen pa.
Saturday ... 2 } Sht caus, pets, adj sums, & gen. pa
Monday..... 4 } Tuesday..... 5 } General paper.
Wednesday 6...Mots. adj. sumns. & gen. pa

Any cause intended to be heard as a short cause must be so marked in the cause book at least one clear day before the same can be put in the paper to be so heard, and the necessary papers must be left in court with the judge's officer the day before the cause is to be put into the paper.

Chancery Court, III.

Mr. Justice CHITTY.

Mon., Feb. 21..Fur cons & non wit list
Tuesday ...22 } Wednesday 23 } Thursday ...24 } Causes with wits
Friday .....25...Motions and non wits list
Saturday ...26 } Pets, sht. caus, adj. sumns (Procedure), & non wit list
Mon.,.....28...Fur cons and non wit list
Tusdy.,Mar. 1 } Wed ..... 2 } Thursday ... 3 } Causes with witnesses.
Friday ..... 4...Motns. & non wit list
Saturday ... 6 } Pets, sht causes, adj smns. (Procedure) & non wit list
Monday..... 7..Fur cons and non wit list
Tues. ..... 8 } Wednesday 9 } Thursday ...10 } Causes with wits
Friday .....11..Motions and non wits list
Saturday ...12 } Pets, sh causes, adj sums, (Procedure) and non wit list
Monday .....14...Fur cons & non wit list
Tuesday.....15 } Wednesday 16 } Thursday ...17 } Non wit list
Friday .....18...Mns and non wits list
Saturday ...19 } Pets, sht. caus, adj sumns, (Procedure), & non wit list
Monday.....21...Fur cons & non wits list
Tuesday .....22 } Wednesday 23 } Thursday ...24 } Non wit list
Friday .....25..Motns. & non wit list
Saturday ...26 } Pets, sht. caus, adj. sumns (Procedure) & non wit list
Monday .....28...Fur cons & non wit list
Tuesday .....29 } Wednesday 30 } Thursday ..31 } Non wit list
Friday, Apr. 1...Motions & non wit list
Saturday .. 2 } Pets, sht. caus, adj. sumns (Procedure) & non wit list
Monday.... 4...Fur cons & non wit list
Tuesday.... 5 } Wednesday 6 } Remaining mtns, remaining pets, and non wits list (if necessary)

Any cause intended to be heard as a short cause must be so marked in the cause book at least one clear day before the same can be put in the paper to be so heard, and the necessary papers must be left in court with the judge's officer the day before the cause is to be put in the paper.

Chancery Court, II.

Mr. Justice NORTH.

Mon., Feb. 21 } Tues..... 22 } Wednesday 23 } Thursday ..24 } General paper.
Friday .....25...Motns. & adj. sums.
Saturday ..26...Sht. caus., pets., adj. sums
Monday....28 } Tues., Mar. 1 } Wed, ... 2 } Thursday ... 3 } General paper
Friday, ... 4...Motions & adj. sumns
Saturday .. 5...Sht caus, pets, & adj sums.
Mon. ..... 7 } Tuesdy,.... 8 } Wednsday.. 9 } Thursday ..10 } General paper.
Friday .....11 .Mtns and adj sms
Sat., ...12..Sat caus, pts, & adj sms
Mond,.....14 } Tuesdy.....15 } Wednesday 16 } Thur, ...17 } General paper.
Friday .....18 .Mtns, & adj sumns
Saturday ..19..Sht caus, pts, & adj sms
Monday ....21 } Tues. .....22 } Wed. .....23 } Thursday ..24 } General Paper
Friday .....25..Mtns and adj sms
Sat .....26..Sht. caus, pets., adj. sumns.
Monday .....28 } Tuesday.....29 } Wednes.....30 } Thursday ...31 } General paper.
Friday, Apr 1...Motns. & adj. sumns.
Saturday ... 2...Sht. caus, pets. adj. sums.
Monday.... 4 } Tuesday..... 5 } General paper.
Wednesday 6...Mtns and adj sms

Any cause intended to be heard as a short cause must be so marked in the cause-book at least one clear day before the same can be put in the paper to be so heard, and the necessary papers must be left in court with the judge's officer the day before the cause is to be put in the paper.

Lord Chancellor's Court.

Mr. Justice STIRLING.

Mon., Feb. 21 } Tues. .....22 } Wednesday 23 } Thursday ..24 } General paper
Friday .... 25...Mtns. adj sums, & gen. pa.
Saturday ..26 } Sht. caus., pets, adj sums. & gen pa
Monday.....28 } Tues., Mar. 1 } Wed. ..... 2 } Thursdy.... 3 } General paper
Friday, ... 4..Motz. adj sums, & gen. pa.
Saturdy.... 5 } Sht. caus., pets, adj sums, & gen. pa.
Mon ..... 7 } Tuesday.... 8 } Wed., ... 9 } General paper
Thursday ..10...Mtns. adj sums. & gen. pa.
Friday .....11...Sitting in chambers
Saturday ..12 } Short caus, pets, adj sums & gen pa.
Mon. .....14 } Tuesdy .....15 } Wed, ...16 } General paper.
Thurs, ...17..Motns. adj sums, & gen. pa
Friday .....18..Sitting in chambers
Saturdy,....19 } Sht caus, pets, adj sumns, & gen pa
Monday,... 21 } Tues. .....22 } Wed.....23 } General paper.
Thursday ..24..Mtns, adj sums & gen pa
Friday .....25..Sitting in chambers
Sat .....26 } Sht. caus., pets., adj. sums. & gen. pa.
Mon .....28 } Tuesday....29 } Wednes.....30 } General paper
Thursday ...31 .Mots. adj. sums. & gen. pa
Friday, Apr 1..Sitting in chambers
Saturday ... 2 } Sht. caus.,ptns. adj. sumns and gen pa
Mon. ..... 4 } Tuesday.... 5 } Wednesday.. 6 } General paper.
Wednesday 6...Mtns, adj sumns & gen pa

Any cause intended to be heard as a short cause must be so marked in the cause book at least one clear day before the same can be put in the paper to be so heard, and the necessary papers must be left in court with the judge's officer the day before the cause is to be put into the paper.

Chancery Court, IV.

Mr. Justice KEKEWICH.

Mon., Feb. 21 } Tusdy. ....22 } Wedsdy.....23 } Thursday ..24 } Friday .....25 } Saturday ..26 } General paper.
Monday ....28 } Tues., Mar. 1 } Wed., ... 2 } Thursday ... 3 } Friday, ... 4 } Saturday .. 5 } General paper.
Mond ..... 7 } Tues ..... 8 } Wed. ..... 9 } Thursday ..10 } Friday .....11 } Sat .....12 } General paper.
Mond.....14 } Tuesday ...15 } Wednesday 16 } Thurs.....17 } Friday, ...18 } Sat . .....19 } General paper
Monday....21 } Tues. .....22 } Wed. .....23 } Thursday ..24 } Friday ....25 } Saturday ..26 } General paper
Monday ... 28 } Tuesday....29 } Wednesday 30 } Thurs. ....31 } Friday, Apr 1 } Sat., ... 2 } General paper.
Monday.... 4 } Tues..... 5 } Wednesday 6 } General paper.

COURT OF APPEAL.

HILARY SITTINGS, 1887.

SPECIAL NOTICE.—Queen's Bench Final Appeals in Court I., and Chancery Appeals (General List) in Court II., will be taken on the usual days during Hilary Sittings.

Queen's Bench Interlocutory Appeals in Court I., and Chancery Interlocutory Appeals in Court II., will be taken on the first day of the Sittings, and afterwards as usual, every Wednesday, during the Sittings. Bankruptcy Appeals also, as usual, on Fridays in Court I.

Appeals from the Lancaster Palatine Court (if any), which have been passed over in the General List, will be taken in Court II. on Thursday, January 13th, and again on the first Thursday in the following months of February and March, namely:—Thursday, February 3rd, and Thursday, March 3rd.

The Admiralty Appeals (with Assessors) will be taken in Court I. on days to be specially appointed by the court.

APPEALS FOR HEARING.

(Set down to Saturday, January 1st, inclusive.)

FROM THE CHANCERY DIVISION, THE PROBATE, DIVORCE AND ADMIRALTY DIVISION (PROBATE AND DIVORCE), AND THE COUNTY PALATINE AND STANNARIES COURTS.

For Judgment.

Edison & Swan United Light Co ld v Woodhouse & Rawson appeal of defts from judgment of Mr Justice Butt for Mr Justice North, dated May 20, 1886 (o a v Dec 20—present Lords Justices Cotton, Bowen, & Fry).

For Hearing.

(General List.)

1885

Lord Camoys v Mayor, &c of Barnsley appl of plntf from judg of V C Bacon (part heard Feb 2, 1886, by Master of Rolls, Lords Justices Lindley & Lopes—s o for engineer to report—report filed—s o till appln made to restore).

The North Central Wagon Co v The Manchester, Sheffield, & Lincolnshire Ry Co appl of plntf Co from judgment of V C Bacon, dated 10th March, 1886 (heard Dec 15, if action not compromised, appl to be in paper on 1st day of sittings for further hearing).

Societe Generale de Paris v Dreyfus Bros & Co app of defts Dreyfus Bros & Co, from order of Mr. Justice Pearson, dated 26 March 1885 April 1 (S O, Feb 1)

1886.

In re Argyll Coal & Cannel Co ld & Co's Acts (J Watson's case) app of Joseph Watson from order of Mr Justice Kay, dated 21 Dec 1885 Jan 11

In re H Stevenson, dec Stevenson v Stevenson app of plt from judgment of Mr Justice Pearson, dated 11 March, 1886 April 3 (S O till after Probate action tried)

Bedwell v Trower app of dft from jdgt of Mr Justice North dated March 16 1886 April 15

Edison & Swan United Light Co ld v Woodhouse & Rawson app of dfts from

jdgt of Mr Justice Butt (sitting as an additional Judge of the Chan Div) dated 25 May, 1886 May 28
In re F Trower, dec Kemble v Trower Young (trustee) v Trower app of dfts from refusal of Mr Justice Kay to vary Chief Clerk's certificate, dated 13 May, 1886 June 2
In re Crawfurd's Settlement Trusts and In re E L Crawfurd's Will and 10 & 11 Vict c 96 app of Thos Thring and ors from order of Mr Justice Chitty, dated 6 May, 1886 June 26 (S O Feb 1)
The Ladywell Mining Co v Huggons app of plf Co from judgt of Mr Justice Stirling, dated 7 July, 1886 July 15
The Ladywell Mining Co v Brookes app of plf Co from judgt of Mr Justice Stirling, dated 7 July, 1886 July 15 (security ordered Nov 24)
In re J Whitaker, decd Christian v Whitaker app of plts from ord of V C Bacon at Chambers, dated 18 June, 1886 July 15
In re Contract for sale of real estate made between Henry Harvey and Arthur Garrard, dated 7 Jan, 1886, and V & P Act, 1874 app of Henry Harvey from ord of V C Bacon, dated 2 July, 1886 July 20
In re Isaac Evans, the younger, dec Davies v Evans app of the Garston and Medway Portland Cement Co from ord of Mr Justice Kay, dated 8 July, 1886 July 23
In re W Sugden, dec Hirst v Sugden app of the Halifax Commercial Banking Co from refusal of Mr Justice Chitty to vary Chief Clerk's certificate, dated 2 July, 1886 July 26
In re Robert Smith, dec Watts v Watts app of defts from part of order of Mr Justice Kay on originating sumns, dated 3 July, 1886 July 27
In re T Price, the elder, dec Price v Gregory app of deft Horatio Gregory from judgt of Mr Justice Kay on originating sumns, dated 7 July, 1886 July 27
In re Thomas Williamson, dec Gray v Williamson app of deft Rebecca Williamson from order of V C Bacon on fur con, dated 12 April, 1886 July 28
In re T H Whorwood, dec Ogle v Lord Sherborne app of deft Lord Sherborne from judgt of Mr Justice North, dated 28 June, 1886 July 29
In re an Appln of Selah Reeve Van Duzer, trading as Reeve & Co, for registration of Trade Mark No. 7509 & 47510 and Patents, Designs, &c, Act, 1883 app of Board of Trade from order of V C Bacon dated 9 July 1886 July 29
In re an Appln of Messrs Leaf, Sons & Co for registration of Trade Mark No 51,141, and Patent &c Act 1883 app of Board of Trade & anr from order of V C Bacon, dated July 30, 1886, directing registration Aug 23 (advanced by order)
In re The New City Constitutional Club Co ld app of Official Liquidator from order of Mr Justice Kay dated 7 & 22 July, 1886 Aug 4
Divorce Ingham, or wse Sachs, petnr, v Sachs, respt app of petnr from decree of Mr Justice Butt dismissing petn for declaration of nullity of marriage, dated 13 July, 1886 Aug 6 (S O with liberty to restore)
Vicary v Stroud app of plt from judgt of Mr. Justice Chitty, dated 17 March 1886 Aug 6 (security ordered Nov 3)
In re N. Corsellis, dec Lawton v Hewes app of defts from order of Mr. Justice Kay, dated 23 June, 1886 Aug 6
In re Mary Harrison, dec Daubeny v Harrison app of defts C J Harrison & ors from order of V C Bacon, dated 15 July 1886 Aug 7
Rawson v Minshull app of plt from Mr Justice Chitty dated 7 July 1886 Aug 9
In re Vincent, dec Vincent v Vincent app of plt from judgt of Mr Justice Stirling, dated 14 July, 1886 Aug 10
Rust v Victoria Graving Dock Co ld and London & St Katharine Docks Co app of defts from orders of Mr Justice Chitty on appins to set aside referee's report, dated 19 July, 1886 Aug 11
Marquis of Londonderry v Russell app of plt from judgt of V C Bacon, dated 24 June, 1886 Aug 13

(To be continued.)

FROM THE QUEEN'S BENCH AND PROBATE, DIVORCE, AND ADMIRALTY (ADMIRALTY) DIVISIONS.

For Judgment.

Watkins v Evans app of deft from Justices Field and Wills, upholding order restraining deft from proceeding under bill of sale (o a v Aug 10—present Master of Rolls and Lords Justices Bowen and Fry)
In re E L Cleaver (exptc F A Rawlings, trustee) app of trustee from Mr Justice Cave refusing to restrain exercise of right of Consolidated, &c, Corpn under bill of sale (o a v Aug 11—present Master of Rolls and Lords Justices Bowen and Fry)
Ship Bernina (damages for loss of life) Armstrong & ors v Mills & ors app of plts from judgt of Mr Justice Butt, dated 2nd March 1886 (o a v Nov 9—present Master of the Rolls and Lords Justices Lindley and Lopes)

For Hearing.

Baroness Wenlock & anr v River Dee Co appl of defts from judgt of Baron Huddleston at trial (pt hd 9 May, 1883, by Master of Rolls and Lords Justices Cotton and Bowen—S O till appln to restore on report of special referee

1886.

Anstruther v Slade app of plt from judgt of Mr Justice Manisty at trial in Middlesex with a jury May 20
Hind v Russell & ors app of plt from Justices Field and A L Smith dismissing (in his absence) app for new trial—action tried by Mr Justice Wills in Middlesex May 22 (set down by appellant as a final app)
Steel, Young & Co v Holder Bros & Co app of defts from judgt of Mr Justice Field at trial in Middlesex with a jury May 27
Crowdy & ors v Worcester City & County Banks Co, ld app of plt from judgt of Mr Justice Manisty at trial in Middlesex June 3
Crawshaw & ors v Hornstadt & anr app of plts from judgt of Mr Justice Cave at trial at Leeds without a jury June 5
Attorney Gen v The Welsh Granite Co, ld & ors (Q B Revenue Side) app of defts from decree of the Lord Chief Justice and Mr Justice Mathew on hearing of information June 8
Petre v Seal app of deft from judgt of Mr Justice Manisty at trial in Middlesex without a jury June 17
Slater & anr v Wilson & Son app of plts from judgt of Mr Justice Denman at trial without a jury at Salford June 21
Burton v Barraclough (dishonoured cheque) app of deft from judgt of Mr Justice Cave at trial without a jury at Leeds June 22
The Eglinton Chemical Co ld v The Yorkshire Tannery & Boot Manufactory ld app of deft from judgt of Baron Pollock at trial June 23
Eastern Steamship Co ld v H B Robertson (The Mersey Forge ld 3rd party—Liverpool D R) app of the Mersey Forge ld from judgt of Mr Justice Denman at trial without a jury at Liverpool June 25
Hull, Barnsley & West Riding June Ry & Dock Co v Yorkshire and Derbyshire Coal & Iron Co ld app of deft Co from judgt of Mr Justice Wills at trial without a jury at Leeds June 30
Earl of Belfast v Horne app of plt from judgt of Baron Pollock at trial without a jury in Middlesex June 30 (security ordered)
Berridge v The Man On Insce Co ld app of plt from judgt of Baron Pollock at trial July 1
Picker v The London & County Banking Co ld app of defts from judgt of Mr Justice A L Smith at trial in Middlesex July 8
Stuart v Bigland & Co app of deft Co from judgt of Mr Justice Field at trial without a jury in Middlesex July 12
Christian v Payne app of deft from judgt of Mr Justice Mathew at trial without a jury in Middlesex July 14
Thomas v Quartermaine (Q B Crown Side) app of plts from Justices Wills and Grantham reversing judgt of Judge of County Court July 15
Holden v Vestry of St. Mary, Islington (Q B Crown Side) app of Hariph Holden from judgt of Justices Hawkins and Day on app from magistrates July 16
Parsons v Dewsbury and anr (interpleader) app of deft F G Clarke from judgt of Baron Huddleston at trial at Lewes July 17
Ibberson & ors v Nook app of plts from Justices Wills and Grantham—action tried by Baron Huddleston in Middlesex July 20
Mann & ors v Kirkwood & Singer's Sewing Machine Co ld app of deft Kirkwood from judgt of Mr Justice A L Smith at trial without a jury at Carlisle July 20 (security ordered)
Hutt v Shaw app of plt from judgt of Mr Justice Hawkins at trial in Middlesex July 20
Hockey v Evans & anr app of dfts from judgt of the Master of the Rolls at trial without a jury in Middlesex July 21

(To be continued.)

HIGH COURT OF JUSTICE.

CHANCERY DIVISION.

HILARY SITTINGS, 1887.

Causes for Trial or Hearing.

(Set down to Saturday, January 1st, inclusive.)

Motions, Petitions, and Short Causes will be taken on the usual days, as stated in the Hilary Sittings Paper.

Causes with and without Witnesses will be taken by Mr. Justice Kay on the usual Cause days in the order as they stand in the Cause Book.

Mr. Justice Chitty will take Witness Causes on the following days, viz.:—
Feb. 8, 9, 10, 15, 16, 17, 22, 23, 24. March 1, 2, 3, 8, 9, 10.

Mr. Justice North will take Witness Causes on days to be named by His Lordship.

Mr. Justice Stirling will take Witness Causes on the ordinary Cause days until further order; his Lordship will sit in Chambers on every Friday during the Sittings.

Mr. Justice Kekewich will take Witness Causes every day, in the order as they stand in the Cause Book.

Adjourned Summonses will be taken as follows:—Mr. Justice Kay, on Fridays and Saturdays; Mr. Justice Chitty, with Non-Witness Actions, except Procedure Summonses, which (if any) are taken every Saturday; Mr. Justice Stirling, on Thursdays and Saturdays.

N.B.—Mr. Justice North will take Adjourned Summonses as follows:—Class I., with Motions, on Fridays; Classes II. and III., in the Non-Witness List; Class IV., on Fridays and Saturdays. For description of each Class see notice issued by his Lordship's Chief Clerks, dated May 1, 1884.

Before Mr. Justice KAY.

Causes for Trial (with witnesses and without witnesses).

Lewis v James act wits
In re Meyrick Hartmann Gillett v Lowndes act (Easter Sittings)
Winter v Ind Coope & Co act wits
Hotson v Furness act wits
Hobson v Darfield Main Coal Co act wits
Morgan v Arnison act
Mulkern v Bell act wits pt hd
In re Fox Fearn v Morgan act
In re Tunnicliffe Wright v Wardle act wits
Bird v Andrew act wits
Cresswell v Davidson act wits
Chauffourier v Ghent act wits
Buckle v Buswell act wits
Coates & Co v Read, Bros, & Co act wits
Whitaker v Barnard act
Atkins's Filter, &c, Co v Lipscombe & Co act wits
In re Pindar, Pindar v Pindar act
Skinner v Langdon act
Clabon v Hutchinson act and m f j
Russell v Davies act
Lowther v Curwen act wits
Gower v Gower act wits
Whorley v Heslop m f j
Kirby v Freeman act wits
Gosling v Gosling act
Tompsett v Heat act wits
Besson v Fountaine act wits
Hayward Bros v Lely and anr act wits
Webster v Greaves act (short)
Schneider v Bond act wits
In re Holland, Diggles v Sheppard m f j and sums
Lloyd v Brown act wits
Thorpe v Shrewsbury act
Symington & Co v Pottman, Pretty, & Co act wits
Gas Light, &c, Co v Towse act wits
In re Beeching Young v Ricketts act wits
General Auction Estate, &c, Co ld v Wright act
In re Snelling Beeching v Snelling act wits
Horsfall v Wood act wits
Mason v Westoby act
Lee v Reed Reed v Lee act wits
Lelasseur v Woodward act wits
In re Stuart Mansion House Chambrs v Stuart act
McQuade v Davison m f j
Ginsbing v Rendell act wits
Fletcher v Chatfield act wits
Tough v Tough m f j
Native Guano Co ld v Sewage Marine Co ld act wits
Chrystal v Simpson act wits
Robinson v Adams act wits
Robinson v Halder act wits
In re Wilson Wilson v Dawson act wits
Venn v Hendriks act wits
Russell v Lamb act and m f j wits
Blair v Deakin act wits
Eden v Deakin act wits

In re Butler Williams v Butler act, wits
Carter v Cox act wits
Earl Beauchamp v Hammack act
Telfer v Telfer act wits
Bird v Hume act
Bird & anr v Hume act
Hine v Bywater act wits
McManus v Cooke act wits
Jones v Levene act wits
Williams v Oxley act
Laudergan v Feast act wits
Hardley v Knight act
Magnus v Queensland National Bank act, wits
Elmore v Pirrie act wits
Atkinson v Same act wits
Tibble v Liquorish act wits
In re Earl of Aylesford's Estate Acts Machell v Earl Poulett act
Denman v Leach act, wits
Benson v Wilson act
Oliver v Nash act wits
Ward v Chapman act wits
Ward v Chapman act wits
Cave v Niblett act wits
Webster, Bart v Southey act wits
Pugh v Salmon act wits
Sharp v Brown act
Sharp v McHenry act
Jelly v Cooper m f j wits
Rowcliffe v Longford Wire Iron &c Co act wits
Anglo-American Brush &c Co v Crompton act
Sharp v Allen act wits
Harris v Newitt act wits
Evans v Benyon act wits
Armitage v Bishop of Manchester act
In re Bond Bigwood v Bond act & m f j
Badart v Smith act wits
Wetmore v Ricketts act wits
Humphreys v Raffety act wits
Parsons v Cotterill act wits
McDonald v Towerzey act wits
Denney v Willis m f j (short)
Harrison v Spitzley act wits
British Equitable, &c, Co v Musgrove act
Williams v Kayler adj summs wits
In re Hardbottle Hardbottle v Hardbottle act wits
Petty v Daniel act wits
In re Paddison Morris v. Paddison act wits
In re Horwood Horwood v Paddison act
De Bensnade v Wood act wits
Eisman v Scholes act and m f j
In re St John St John v St John act and summs wits
Hancock v Wyatt act
Hawkes v Curtice
In re Shuttleworth Briggs v Shuttleworth m f j (short)
Joy v Renner act wits
McBryde v Dover act wits
Davy v Barnett m f j
Owen v Roberts act
Newsome v Hill act wits
Further Considerations.
In re Doewra Doewra v Faith fur con and summs
Beadnall v Ayre fur con
In re Oliver Jarman v Salkeld fur con
In re Angus Churchman v Churchman fur con
In re Newman Newman v Baker fur con & summs
Phillips v Andrews fur con
Reid v Laing fur con & summs to vary
In re Swift Swift v Swift fur con
Walker v Poole Poole v Walker fur con

Adjourned Summonses.

In re Barnard's Will Barnard v White
In re Bradbrook's Estate Lock v Willis
In re Duke's Estate Thomas v Duke
In re Speer & Trade Marks Act
In re Brackenbury Chittenden v Wood
In re Browne Anderson v Browne
Expte Mayor, &c, of London In re Met & Dist Ry Act, 1879, &c, and Land Clauses Act
In re Courtier Coles v Courtier
In re Newman Newman v Baker
Goodall v Pemberton, and motn in Pemberton v Goodall
In re Beste Best v Guadadin
In re Duffield Masters v Tabrum
In re Curtis & Betts, Solicitors (taxn)
In re Jovansson Blackmore v Jovansson
Howell v Price
Republic of Peru v Dreyfus Bros & Co
Austin v Davids
In re Skinner Catrney v Skinner
In re Messing Elmes v Dain
In re Silkstone, &c, Co, & Co's Acts
In re Hasselis's Estate (No 1) Hasselis v Hunt
In re Smyth Crotch v Bishop
In re Merricks Dixon v Johnson
In re Foster Foster v Dixon
In re Coward Coward v Larkman
In re Manning Walton v Bishop
Clough v Cuts
Austin v Davids
In re Courtier Coles v Courtier
In re Bourne Rymer v Harpley
In re Stoss Mangles v Mangles
In re Harvey Harvey v Roberts
In re Clarke Coome v Carter
Native Guano Co. ld. v Sewage Manure Co ld

Before Mr. Justice CHITTY.

Causes for Trial (with witnesses)

Albery v Broadbent m f j pt hd with wits by order
Le Blond v Curtis set down by ord
Randall v New Cross Public Hall Co, lmd, New Cross Public Hall Co, lmd, v Randall, Morton v Randall claim and counter-claim
Baroness Wenlock v Ryder act (transferred from Q B Div)
Beddington v Atlee act
Saunders v Potter Potter v Saunders act and counter claim
Murray v Tuson act
Hart v Bettesworth act
Askew v Browne act
Brough v Dando act
Swann v Murr act
Bralsford v Patton act
Higgins v Hill act
Hemming, orse Hall v Fielden issue for trial
Potter v Dudeney In re Jas Potter, dec In re E Stapley, dec In re Jno Potter Potter v Dudeney cons acts
Collison v Hingston act
Stuckey's Banking Co v Ponsford act
Scott v Milbank 1885 S 3,028 act
Scott v Milbank 1885 S 3,093 act
In re Witherden, dec Bedford v Witherden act
Moseley v Victoria Rubber Co act
Grummant v Robbins act & m f j
Burnham v Irvine act
Belfrage v Lindsay act
Kelly v Kelly act
Wood v Harris act
Ehrlich v Ihlee & anr act
Whitaker v Jeakes act
Sharp v Gooddy, Cripps & Sons, ld act
James v Peerless act (S O Mar 1)
Attorney-Gen v Anderson Anderson v Hawkins claim and counter claim
A G Kurtz & Co v Peter Spence & Sons m f j (treated as action for trial, by order)
Johnstone v Newfoundland Guano Co ld act
Bean v Dawson act
Gardner v Titley act
Hope-Johnstone v Jervis act
Stevens v Pares act
Gould v Gould act
Green v Edwards act
In re Tinkler, dec Lloyd v Allen act
Redford v Shoppe act
Anderson v Patent Oxonite Co & ors act & m f j against deft R R Vizier
Turner v Tymin act
Gt Western Forest of Dean Colliery Co ld v Trafalgar Colliery Co ld act
Gillibrand v Hope act
In re Hughes, dec Vibart v Vibart adj summs with wits by order
In re J Walker's Estate Walker v Archer adj summs with wits by order
In re Oriental Bank adjd summs of Wm Simpson, a creditor with wits by order
Moore v Sams & Co m f j
In re C Dash dec Darley v King act & Summs in King v Darley under Order 55 by order
Hobbs v Wayet act
Eccleston v Eccleston act
Leith v Cooke act
Rait & Gardiner v Dry Docks Corpn of London ld act
Morgan v Harmer m f j with cross examination on affidavits
Smith v McJannet act
In re Roser dec Roser v Featherstone act
Holt & ors v Duke & ors act
Norman Oakley & Co v Beauchamp fur con after Official Receiver's Report & trial of counter claim (with wits) reserved by order of Nov 28 1883
London & Westminster Bk ld v Turquand & ors act
Atkinson on behalf &c v De Jeanson Hugelman on behalf &c v Atkinson claim and counter claim with summs
In re Honduras Inter-Oceanic Ry Co (petn) by order
Hammersley v Hammersley & ors act
Alexander v London Founders' Assn act
Hargreaves v Trustee of Massey and Hargreaves act
Hall v Palmer act
Williams v Neath Canal Navgn Proprietors Neath Canal Navgn Proprietors v Williams claim & counter claim
Wearing v Parkins act
Boyd v Patrick act
Ashley v Drew act
Lichfield v Simmons act
Coote v Ingram act
Wenham Co. ld v May & Co act
Edison & Swan United Electric Light Co ld v Shippey Bros act
London Taverns Co ld v Worley act
Duke of Northumberland v Bowman act
Hards v Bragg act
Smith v Taverner act
Brinton v Howlett Glading v Brinton claim & counter claim
Tristam v Eld act
Randall v Evans act & mtn for judgt
In re Moone, dec Moone v Moone act
Condy & Mitchell, ld, v Taylor, &c, Co ld act

Non-witness Causes, Adjourned Summonses and Special Cases.

Penon v Cutfield m f j
In re Hollingbourne Paper Co ld (Harbour's claim) adj smns (S O Feb 1)
Bergheim v Hornsea Pier Co adj smns to dismiss action by contractor
In re J Weedon's Estate Weedon v Longworthy org smns Ex pte will trusts (balance of share)
In re F Sykes's Estate Sykes v Sykes adj smns Ex pte plt (review taxn)
In re E T St John's Estate St John v St John originating summs (construction of settlement)
In re D Tidey's Estate Brooks v Tidey adj sums Ex parte Plt (payment into court)
In re Drake & Pilkington, Solicitors, Huddersfield Ex parte Plt adj sumns (review taxation)
In re Thos Wilson's Estate Dawson v Wilson adj sumns (charge as real estate)
In re Stogdon, a solicitor Ex parte Baker & Wife adj smns (for delivery of bill)
Ex parte School Board for London and Fowler's Trustees (claim of trustees for sale) adj appln from Chmbrs by ord of March 29
Exors of Metzler v Chappell originating smns (for working out accounts)
In re Jno Lyon's Deed Poll Dixon v Roberts adj smns (ord 55)
In re Griffiths's Settlement & S L Act Griffiths v Griffiths adj smns (construction)
In re Gray's Brewery, ld adj smns (review taxation)
In re J Snelling, dec Foster v Matthew adj smns (adm legacies)
In re Jos Davies's Settlement Trusts Stoughton v Fagg adj smns (trust for sale)
Sartin v Sturges sp o
In re Northumberland Avenue Hotel Co, ld (Fox & Braithwaite's claim) adj smns
In re Hughes, dec Hughes v Nevett adj smns
In re Thomas Keetley, dec Keetley v Keetley adj smns
In re J C Peck, dec Piggott v Whyte (Bradley's claim) adj smns
In re Robert Comer, dec Comer v Ollis adj smns (ord 55)
Browne v Blackburne adj smns (payment out)
Cropper v Smith & anr adj smns (bill of costs)
Chamberlayne v Rix m f j
In re T. E. Williams, decd Williams v Williams sp o
Hainsworth v Dawson adj summs (interest on balance)
In re Musgrave's Estate Rhodes v Attorney-Gen. adj smns (charity scheme)
In re Jeremiah Hallett's Estate adj smns (order 55)
In re Henry Nerwick's Will Trusts Nerwick v Aithans expte extrix. & anr adj smns
In re Llangennech Coal Co, ld adj smns
In re Carr's Estate Ledgard v Lewin adj smns (order 55)
Windover v Evans m f j
In re Ann Marshall, dec Macleod v Muller Ex pte Malcolm Macleod adj summs (taxation)
In re Wm. Averill's Will Trusts Buckle v Coombe Ex pte A E Buckle & ors adj summs (under ord 55)
In re Rev George Curry's Estate Gibson v Way originating summs (claiming as reversionary devisees and legatees)
In re Blagden's Estate Prentice v Blagden (construction of will) adj summs (under ord 55)
In re Rev Jas Coyte's Estate Coyte v Coyte adj summs (under ord 55)
In re Major Dawson, dec Hill v Johnson (construction of will) adj summs (under ord 55)
In re Fanny B Lousada, dec Bacon v Bacon adj summs of exors and trustees (under ord 55)
In re Neath Harbour Smelting and Rolling Works, ld & Co's Acts Ex parte Official Liquidator — against directors under sect 153
In re Hull, Barnsley, and West Riding Junc Ry & Dock Act, 1880 adj summs
In re Wm A Miller, dec Miller v Cater adj summs
Brough v Dando adj summs by dfts to vary Chief Clerk's certificate Brough v Dando adj summs by plt for payment into court
Boyd v Patrick adj summs by deft Patrick to vary Chief Clerk's certificate
Smallman to Wells V & P Act adj summs of Elihu Smallman and anr (vendors)
In re Abraham Hobson, dec Crowther v Holden adj summs
In re F Barne's Estate Barne v Barne (construction) adj summs of exors & trustees
Sharpe v Torkington Torkington v Sharpe m f j
Attorney-Gen v Wyggeston's Hospital act
In re Henry Wood's Estate Woods v Woods adj smns Ex pte Woods (taxation)
In re H Lindus's Estate Lindus v Lindus adj smns (dividends)
In re Gaches' Estate Newton v Gaches adj smns
In re Atty's Estate Welby v Welby (construction of will) adj smns (under ord 55)
Coates v Legard Ex pte Shafto Trust adj smns
In re Mary Kenyon, dec Mann v Knapp adj smns
Westerman v Bury & Tottington District Ry Co act
Badham v Grant m f j
In re The Capital Fire Insurance Assn ld adj smns (Ex pte Peoria, counter claim)

In re Robert Chapman & Solr adjd summs (tax bill)
Clarke v Thornton adjd summs (fund for repairs)
In re Spence's Metal Co ld Expte Official Liquidator adjd summs
In re Robert Morton dec Morton v Morton adjd summs
In re T B Crowther dec Baker v Cranbrook act & m f j
Justice v Fooks act & adjd summs in Fooks v Burton
Kinder v Walker act
In re Chas Daniel's Estate Daniel v Gilson adjd summs under order 55
In re G Rutherford's Settled Estate Settled Land Act powers of tenant for life adjd summs
In re Cilfodan Benefit Building Soc distribution of assets adjd summs of Official Liquidator
In re Archer Burton's Settlement Trusts Pemberton v Archer-Burton adjd summs to confirm compromise
In re Tempro's Estate Lovegrove v Warner adjd summs as to applin under ord 55
In re W M Pybus, a solicitor adj sms to tax bill
In re Star Cab Co, ld adj sms of holder of bill of sale
In re Richardson's Estate Shuldham v R N Lifeboat Institution adj sms of E B Shuldham
In re B Winthrop's Estate Winthrop v Winthrop adj summs
In re C Williams's Estate Smith v Hill adj sms
In re G W Hayne, dec Hayne v Rogan mtn for judgt
Meston v Kelday act

Further Considerations.

In re Wilkinson, dec Wilkinson v Harper 2nd fur con
Byfield v Mores fur con
In re F T Buckland, dec Buckland v Bennett fur con
Hepworth v Binks fur con (short)
In re Charles Rollinson, dec Wakefield & Barnsley Union Bank v Rollinson Tucker v Rollinson fur con
In re James Bainbridge and Wife, dec Goren v Pain fur con

Before Mr. Justice North.

Causes for Trial (with witnesses).

In re Millichamp Goodale v Bullock act
In re Trevithick Trevithick v Jenkins act
Blake v Tyerman act
Barber v Halliwell act
Walker v James act
Richardson v Castrey act
Linnell v Rawson act
Southall v Walker act
Walker v Southall act & m f j
Ruthven v Ruthven act
Miller v Jones act
Murgatroyd v Nicholson act
Pressley v Hodgson act
Brown v Clark act
In re Young Doggett v Revett act
Russell v Norton act
Drage v Sir W G Hartopp act
Halliwell v Barker act
Bravet v Burlet act
Lands Allotment Co ld v London & Tilbury Ry Co act
Taylor v Graham act
Fox v Denton act
Croft v Rickmansworth Highway Board act
Finnis v Wilks act
In re Bennett Knapp v Bennett act
Bowman v Hopper act
Holmes v Steep Grade Trams Co ld act
Baron Rene de Blonay v Brin Freres, &c, Co act
Hodgkin & Co v Hopper act
Von Bartels v Greenwood act
Hillcary v Taylor act
Compton v Robinson act
In re McClure Bowers v Seddon act
Tebb v Grey question of fact
Evans v Manchester, &c, Ry Co act
Wall v Stanwick act
Humphrey v Scott act
McClure v Pringle act
Hall v Ewin act
Michael v Price act
Tritton v Bankart act
Holden v Collier act
Balsom v Webb act
Davies Bros & Co v Davies act
Newton v Barker act
Gooding v Wiltshire act
In re Woodward Woodward v Woodward act
Edison & Swan Electric Light, &c, Co v Davidson & ors act
In re Knapp Bennett v Knapp act
Pashley v Chapman issue for trial
Lucas v Martin & anr act
In re Allen Allen v Capps act
Leslie v Cave act
Soper v Arnold act
Locks v White act
Walker v West Riding Union Bkg Co ld act
Wood v Horne act
Franklin, Hocking & Co v Franklin, Hocking act
North v Davis act
Daniel v McMillan act
Nicol v Campbell act
Frank v Cottrell act
Collins v Castle act
Luck, Bart. v Richards act
Bateman v Poplar Dist Bd of Works act
Ware v Freeth act
In re Hope, Hope v Porter act
Davies v Hodgson act
Winter v Baker act & m f j
Cowan v Midl & S W Junc Ry Co act
Lamplugh v Powell, Foley, & Co act
Chatteris v Isaacson act
Hawkins v Hawkins act
Malcolm v Trustees of Rose Cresswell, bankrupt act
Stobbs v Kelsey act
In re Farrow, Moore v Farrow act
Hon E H Legge v London Tramways Co ld act
Bunting v Mulkern act
In re Fletcher, Barnett v Fletcher act
Barnett v Fletcher act
Urquhart v Butterfield act
Wood v Aylward act
Topham v Booth act
Ede v Watson act
Paget v Ethouit act
Stock v Ellison act
R. James v The Queen act
Ronaldson v Balpitt act
Wright v Piller act
Cooke, Sons, & Co v New River Co act
Todd v Herring act
Greenwood v Ellison act
Furber v Best act
Noakes v Room act
Sahler v Fuchs act
Caswell v Hunter act
Kime v Gardner act
Rowe v School Board for London act

Causes for Trial (without witnesses) and Adjourned Summonses (Classes II. and III.)

Carnochan v Ireland act
Parker v Parker act
In re Andrew Morton v Andrew adj sms
In re Horobin Ash v Horobin adj sms
In re Knight Knight v Burgess adj sms
Connolly v Connolly special case
In re Gray Sheppard v Gray special case & mtn for judgt
In re Hunt Nash v Bischoff adj sms
Lloyd v Gordon adj sms
Reeves v Stones m f j
In re Fuller Earp v Harrison adj sms
In re Cross Page v Hancock adj sms
Tufnell v Nichols act
In re Webb Palmer v Webb adj sms
Vertue Cross v Johnson adj sms
In re Reed Reed v Powell adj sms
In re Crawford Myers v Crawford adj for sms
In re Hartley Stedman v Dunster adj sms
In re Same Same v Same applin of plt
In re Same Same v Same applin of J Colling
In re Knowles Pudsaint v Jones adj sms
In re Marshall Phillips v Marshall adj sms
In re Cousins Alexander v Stevens adj sms
Willsmer v Field m f j
In re Marchioness of Londonderry Clayton v Marchioness of Londonderry adj sms
In re Chalk Chalk v Coombs adj sms
Rowley v Fiennes act
King v Chamberlayne act
In re Maxwell Maxwell v Maxwell adj sms
Wells v Holton m f j
In re Gardiner Jones v Gardiner adj sms
In re Lawrence Bickerstaff v Lawrence adj sms
Hodgkins, Burnett, & Co v Hopper act
Crossman v Richards act & m f j
In re Hanbury Hanbury v Isaacs adj sms
In re Cobb Frost v Cobb adj sms
In re Balding Balding v Balding adj sms
In re Marseilles Extension Ry and Land Co ld, &c adj sms
In re Hardy Hardy v Lester adj sms
Fitzhugh v Elliott act & m f j
In re Henderson Nouvion v Freeman issue for trial
Gee v Palmer m f j
In re Elves Folkes v Elves adj sms
In re Hitchcock Kirk v Hitchcock adj sms
Gould v Crawshay act
Hopper v Poyser act
Gibbs v Morgan adj sms
In re Houlton Houlton v Houlton adj sms (to keep its place in wit list)
In re Barwick Corner v Stahl act
In re Brewer Birt v Vesper adj sms
In re Green Green v Green adj sms
In re Beardmore Beardmore v Beardmore adj sms
Jones v Vaughan adj sms
In re Hulton Lister v Hulton adj sms
In re Sainsbury Sainsbury v Collins adj sms
In re Symes Andrews v Symes adj sms
In re Bodger Bodger v Bodger act
Jenkins v Thomas act
In re Fletcher Sir A L Smith v Fletcher adj sms
In re Russell Pavier v Millington adj sms
Richardson v Feary m f j
In re Mallam Goold v Mallam adjd sms
In re Clayton Hill Co & Co's Acts adjd sms
In re Davey Brading v Davey adjd sms
Birmingham &c Building Soc v Coope m f j
In re Crookes Lamm v Crookes adjd sms
Crowfoot v Bennett m f j
In re Blackden Franklyn v Holland adjd sms
Lodge v Poole act
In re Gardiner Gardiner v Courthope adjd sms
In re Marshall Clay v Drew adjd sms
Harrison v Landor act & motion
Elliott v Steel adjd sms
In re Fisher Fisher v Moss adjd Sms
In re Rimer Chambers v Dickinson adjd sms
Darley v Brenan act & m f j
Mears v Bull act
In re an Arbitration between the British & Portishead Pier and Ry Co and the Mayor &c of Bristol special case
In re an Arbitration between the Portishead Warehouses ld and the Bristol and Portishead Pier & Ry Co special case

Further considerations.

In re Hendry, Watson v Blackney fur con
In re Lee Lee v Cooke fur con
Ashworth v Munn fur con & pcts pt hd
David v Abraham fur con
Gruggen v Gruggen 2nd fur con
In re Allen, Allen v Edwards fur con & sums
Bridger v Bent fur con
In re Oxenham, Ford v Oxenham fur con
In re Lord Southampton, Allen v Lord Southampton fur con
Temple v Thring fur con
In re Robinson, Robinson v Robinson fur con
In re J J Smith, Smith v Smith fur con
In re Jordan King v Picard fur con
In re Seymour, Seymour v Hall fur con & sums
In re Hooker, Hooker v Parry fur con
In re Saunders-Davies, Saunders-Davies v Saunders-Davies fur con
In re Meehan, Hogarth v Meehan fur con & sums
Jones v Harris fur con
Hancock v Hancock fur con

Adjourned Summonses.
(Class IV.)

In re Payne Rea v Ashmead
Earl of Lytton v Humbert
Cavendish v Cavendish
Waterhouse v Macgregor
In re Commercial Bank of South Australia & Co's Acts
In re Smith Pearson v Smith
In re Stevens Stevens v Kelly
In re Same Same v Same
Syer v Gladstone
In re J Sanders-Herbert, solor, &c to review taxn
Lichfield v Jones
Imbert-Terry v Carver
In re Jackson Smith v Sibthorpe
Parish v Poole
In re Tucker Tucker v Smith
In re Beyfus, solors
In re North Staffordshire Coal Co. & Co's Acts
McDougall v Knight
In re Errington, Errington v Errington
In re Waterman, Moss v Milbank
Jones v Lockyer
Chambers v Chambers
In re Harris & ors (taxn)
Honeybun v Honeybun
In re Hobson & Howes and V & P Act, 1874, &c
In re Hurter & Trade Marks Act, &c
In re Seyton, Seyton v Satterthwaite
In re Wilcock & Settled Land Act
North v Sheffield
In re Calisher, Morris v Calisher
In re Rollason, Rollason v Hales
In re Joseph Davis's Charity, &c
In re Portishead Dock Undertaking & Bristol Dock Act, 1884

Before Mr. Justice Stirling.

Causes for Trial (with Witnesses).

Williams v Bells act
Bacon v Camphausen act
Chadwick v Kynaston act
Tindall v Barnetts, Hoares & Co act
Bedingfield v Allen act & motn for judgt
Ross Improvement Commrs v Usborne act
Venables v Burton act
Smith, Paterson & Co ld v Abbotsbury Ry Co act
In re Meynell, Meynell v Meynell act
Purton v Horton act
Leeds Estates Building &c Co v Shepherd act
In re Hoult, Godfrey v Mansfield act & two sums
Weston v Reversionary Interest Society act
Peck, Bart v Derry act
Sheppard v Gilmore act
In re Greenhill Greenhill v Lovibond act
Reynolds v Seeley Seeley v Reynolds act
Roberts v Webb act
Grimmer v Chapman Hewetson v Grimmer act
Briggs v Hard act
Poulton v Jeffryes act
Lumley v Haines act

In re Gray, McMillan v Gray act
In re Nayler, Naylor v Daws act
Cavanagh v Riddell act
McClelland v Clouts act
Lewis v Haywood & Sons act
Rawlins v Webb act
Lound v Grimwade issue for trial
Godfrey v Winsford act
Skidmore v Skidmore act
Miles v Fox act
Tolley v Nelson act
Willoringhams v Klinker act
Islip v Ord act
In re Lane Grove v Lane act
Flint v Butler adj smns
Humpherson v Syer act
Wells v Hammer act
Fraser v Province of Brescia, &c, Co act
Davis v Vickery act
In re Lady Honywood Furley v Denne act
Jones v Gehrke act
Lamb, Bart. v Chambers act and m f j
Lambton & Co v Johnson act
Wardens of St Saviours, Southwark v Gery act
Knight v Jones act
Burke v Jones act
Wadge v Garrold act
Humphrey v Sumner act
Schlusser v Hilton act
In re H. Batt Jones v Peach act
Clowes v Beckles act
Notton v Gunsel act
Whatford v Rast act
Smith v Salaman act
Harper v Murray act
Jackson v Tetley act
Gurney v Winchester House Co ld act
In re Loftus Otway Otway v Loftus Otway act
In re Whitehead In re Rees Whitehead v Tracy act
Lewis v Evans & Co act
Woodall v Edwardes act
Haywood v Whitaker act
Smith v Bowler act
United Telephone Co ld v Mottershead & Co question of facts
Parker v Bingham act
Freke v Houseman
Hough v Saul
Coates & Co v Moyle & Son act
Bray v Gardner act
Lee v Neuchatel Asphalte Co ld act
Wallen v Dickinson act
Hill v Sheffield act
Cole v Stead act
Pollard v Catt act
Richards v Deane act
Sonnenschein v Barnard & anr act
Branchi v Bennett act
Morgan & Co ld v C S Windover & Co ld act
Racy v Rady act
Gardener v Vicat & ors act
Brooking v Maudsley Sons & Field act
Fisher v Holland act
Russell v Geere act
Farwig v Harland act
In re Rust Bull v Rust
Prior v Moore act
Newen v Owen act
Ferris, Townshend & Co v Weston act
Smith v School Board for Prescott act

Causes for Trial (without witnesses)
In re Meynell Holmes v Meynell issue of fact
Chamberlin v Taylor act
Locke v Dunlop act
Pearce v Clemishaw act
Culver v Ridgway m f j
Meldola v Carvallio act
McIver v Hill act
Thoday v Manning m f j
In re Wailes Wailes v Wailes sp o
Quayle v Birkett m f j (short)
In re E Trueman Bradley v Turnbull act
In re J Trueman Bradley v Turnbull act
Jones v Harris m f j (short)
Eyre v Priddle m f j (short)

Further Considerations.
In re Wood Wood v Wood fur con & two sumns
In re McBlackaley McDermott v Calrers fur con
In re Faulkner Gardner v Faulkner fur con
In re Nicol Purdham v Nichol fur con & sumns
In re Knott Bax v Palmer fur con
Johnson v Johnson fur con
In re Chapman Fardell v Chapman fur con
Adkins v Bliss fur con
In re Lange Lange v Lange 2nd fur con
In re Fenton Fenton v Fenton fur con (short)

Adjourned Summonses.
In re Errington's Trusts Bawtree v Errington
Bailey v Bailey
In re Dolby Dolby v Brown pt hd
In re Wilson In re Brereton Dew v Brereton
In re Coupland Coupland v Somerville
In re Blundell Blundell v Blundell
In re Brisley Fleming v Brisley (3 smns)
In re Marrett Chalmers v Wingfield
In re Barlow Barlow v Felstead
In re Warden In re Gilbart Browett v Warden
Islip v Ord
In re Vint Williams v Williams
In re Chater, Mander v Harrison pt hd
In re Vincent, Goodman v Vincent
Williams v Jones
In re Ashmole, Ashmole v Ashmole
In re Coleman, Blehampton v Coleman
Bull v Elliott
In re Tucker, Bowchier v Gordon
In re Toby, Lockhart v Hastings
In re E Williams, Powell v Williams
In re Tineman, Smith v Turnbull
In re Messrs Wilton & Sons, Solrs
Weston v Reversionary Investment Society
Willis v Birdsey
In re C C Sheen, an Infant
In re E Wood, Wood v Wood
Packe v Nesotti
In re Walker, Walker v Oulton
In re McQueen, McQueen v McQueen
Broome v Oats
In re J Rodgers, Wilkinson v Rodgers
In re Missouri Estates Ry & Iron Co, ld (Ex parte Robinson)
In re Charles Pilgrim (decd) & L C Act, 1865
In re Tilley & Weld & V & P Act, 1874
Parker v Bingham
In re Eyton to Williams & V & P Act, 1874
In re Burgess George v Stothard
In re Lloyd Estate Faithful v Lloyd
In re Tasker Tasker v Hunt
In re C S Raynor, an infant
In re Coppard Howlett v Hodson
In re Robinson Longrigg v Robingon
Poolee v Lightfoot
In re Eyton to Jones & V & P Act, 1874
In re Sparks to Wigan, &c & V & P Act, 1874
In re Senger Senger v Charles
Galmoye v Brown
In re Reid Jeffryes v Crofton
De Mora v Concha De Mora v Concha pt hd
In re Hand's Estate Walling v Chick
In re W Tyson Simon v Hayston
In re John Andrews Hedgecock v Aylmore
In re E Westall West v Westall
Salwey v Salwey
In re W H Cooper Cooper v Cooper
In re Winton Deane v Winton
In re Atkinson Hindson v Bird
Garnham v Skipper

Before Mr. Justice KEKEWICH.
Causes for Trial (with witnesses).
Webb v St. John's Gas Co act (not before March 31)
In re Evan Jones Jones v Williams act
Lewis v Baskerville act

Transferred from Justices KAY, CHITTY and Pearson, for Trial or Hearing only—by Order, dated 11th May, 1885.
Manners v Hooper act
Aberdare &c Co v Hankey act
In re Moore Bates v Moore act
Rucker v Moffatt act
Allcard v Skinner act
Cuttill v McSheehan act
Yates & Co v Thornton & Co act
Mileham v Tibbets act
Stanley (on behalf &c) v Mayor &c of Norwich act
In re Wickham Maroney v Taylor act

Transferred from Justices CHITTY, NORTH, & STIRLING, for Trial or Hearing only—by Order, dated Nov 24, 1886
In re Maudsley Maudsley v Hughes act
Grogan v Sutton, Bart act
Janson v Mowatt act
In re H Jones Jones v Digby act
Attorney-Gen v Met Ry Co ld act
Laev Chiv mpion & Co ld act
Firth v Slingsby act
Wilkinson v Alcock act
Ager v Blacklock act
Sequin v Dangars & anr act
Bankes v Small Act
J C Gostling & Co ld v J C Gostling act
Royal Bristol Perm Ben Soc v Bomash act
Tucker v Bennett act
Parker v Brown act
Arnott v Hayes act
In re E W Jones Jones v Cottier act
Williams v Alt act
Pickersgill v Booth act
Real Property Trust ld v Harrison act
Hammond v Robertson act
In re Morris Lewis v Prosser Prosser v Lewis act
Sheppard, on behalf, &c, v Scinde, Punjaub, &c, Co act
Ghirelli v Pryor act
Jeakes v Tibbitts act
Orchard v Williams act
Williams v Martin act
Howlett v Medway Navigatn Proprs act
In re Turner, Cork v Hutchinson act
Crofton v Wood act
Winter v Davis act
Hartopp v Hartopp act
Parker's Trustees v Hartopp act
In re Ogle, Evett v Ogle act
Prior v Essex act
Powell v Vickerman act
Nash v Hayward act
Davey v Moody act
Alexander v Mollison act
Debenham v Pickess act
Rogerson v Simpson act
French v Hope act
Macready v Harman act
Stuckey v Coleman act
Heath v Brooks act
Perrin v Baker act
James v Lovel act
Wright v Horrocks act
Wolferstan v Middleton act
Smethurst v Sir C. Lindsay & Co ld act
Griffin v Bentley m f j
Shield v Winder act
Met Dist Ry Co v Met Ry Co act
Met Dist Ry Co v Met Dist Joint Com & Met Ry Co act
Earl of Chichester v Morton act
Wylson & Long v Dana act
In re Deuston Deuston v Deuston act
Coburn v Collins act
Childs v Warren act
Burr v Wimbledon Local Board act
London Portland Cement Co ld v Northfleet Brickfields Co ld act
Stephenson v Banks act
Charwood v Evans act
Duke of Marlborough v Equity Law Life &c Soc act
Newman & Co v Pinto & Son act
Mellor v Thompson act
Pidgley v Ellis act
Young v Greenfield act
Shore v Pratt act
Midland Ry Co v Micklethwait act
Stone v Smith act
Carter v Walls act
In re M Watson Watson v Duncan act (Easter sittings)
In re Darby Vaughan v Pennefather act
Smith v Harding act
James v Pearless & Son act
Kinnear's Patent ld v Allbright act
Golonya v Rath act
Ostertag v French action transferred from Q B Division
Hart v Randall action ordered to go to bottom of List

WINDING UP NOTICES.

London Gazette.—FRIDAY, Dec. 31.

JOINT STOCK COMPANIES.

LIMITED IN CHANCERY.

ABERCORRIS SLATE AND SLAB Co, LIMITED.—Chitty, J., has fixed Saturday, Jan 8, at 11.30, at his chambers, for the appointment of an official liquidator

ALEXANDRA (NEWPORT) DOCKS AND MAINDEE OMNIBUS Co, LIMITED.—North, J., has, by an order dated Dec 17, appointed Richard Giles, Silverton Villa, Maindee, nr Newport, Mon, to be official liquidator. Creditors are required, on or before Feb 14, to send their names and addresses to the above. Tuesday, March 1, at 12, is appointed for hearing and adjudicating upon debts and claims

DISTRICT BANK OF LONDON, LIMITED.—Petn for winding up, presented Dec 28, directed to be heard before North, J., on Saturday, Jan 15. Cheese & Green, Pall Mall, solors for petner

RHONNDA-MERTHYR STEAM COAL COLLIERY Co, LIMITED.—Stirling, J., has fixed Monday, Jan 10, at 12, at his chambers, for the appointment of an official liquidator

SOMERSET BREWERY Co, LIMITED.—Petn for winding up, presented Dec 21, directed to be heard before North, J., on Saturday, Jan 15. Marsland & Co, Chancery lane, agents for Curtis & Son, Neath, solors for petner

COUNTY PALATINE OF LANCASTER.

LIMITED IN CHANCERY.

LUNE SHIPPING Co. LIMITED.—By an order made by the Vice Chancellor, dated Dec 14, it was ordered that the company be wound up. Mason & Grierson, Liverpool, solors for petner

SEFTON HOSIERY Co, LIMITED.—By an order made by Bristowe, V C., dated Dec 13, it was ordered that the company be wound up. Winder, Bolton, solors for petner

FRIENDLY SOCIETIES DISSOLVED.

FRIENDLY SOCIETY, National School, Haggate, Briercliffe, Lancaster. Dec 24

KNIGHTS OF THE WOOD FRIENDLY SOCIETY, Hearty Good Fellow Inn, King st, Old hill, Stafford. Dec 29

London Gazette.—TUESDAY, Jan. 4.

JOINT STOCK COMPANIES.

LIMITED IN CHANCERY.

BIRCHILLS HALL IRON Co, LIMITED.—Chitty, J., has fixed Friday, Jan 14, at 12.30, at his chambers, for the appointment of an official liquidator

HERMANN LOOG, LIMITED.—Petn for winding up, presented Jan 1, directed to be heard before North, J., on Saturday, Jan 15. Goldberg & Langdon, West st, Finsbury circus, solors for petners

LLYNVI AND TONDU Co, LIMITED.—Petn for winding up, presented Dec 28, directed to be heard before Kay, J., on Jan 15. Johnston & Co, Raymond bldgs, Gray's inn, agents for Winder, Bolton, solors for petner

ROYAL EXCHANGE SHIPPING Co, LIMITED.—Petn for winding up, presented Jan 1, directed to be heard before Chitty, J., on Saturday, Jan 15. Ashurst & Co, Old Jewry, solors for petners

ROYAL EXCHANGE SHIPPING Co. LIMITED.—Petn for winding up, presented Jan 1, directed to be heard before Chitty, J., on Jan 15. Botterell & Roche, Leadenhall st, solors for petner

COUNTY PALATINE OF LANCASTER.
LIMITED IN CHANCERY.

ALBION BANK AND DISCOUNT Co, LIMITED.—By an order made by the Vice-Chancellor, dated Dec 20, it was ordered that the company be wound up. Brabner & Court, Liverpool, solors for petner

FRIENDLY SOCIETIES DISSOLVED.

DEVONSHIRE CLUB AND INSTITUTE, Camden house, Chiswick. Dec 30
EQUITY FRIENDLY SOCIETY, Suffolk Arms, Boston st, Hackney rd. Dec 31
FRIENDLY SOCIETY, Primitive Methodist Schoolroom, Norton Canes, Stafford. Dec 30
LYNN SHIPWRECKED SEAMEN'S SOCIETY, Beehive Inn, Bridge st, South Lynn, King's Lynn, Norfolk. Jan 1

NOTICES TO CREDITORS UNDER TRUSTEES RELIEF ACT, for insertion in the *London Gazette* or any newspaper, should be sent to Harrison and Sons, Publishers *London Gazette*, 45, St. Martin's-lane, W.C. The *Gazette* is published every Tuesday and Friday.—[ADVT.]

CREDITORS' NOTICES.
UNDER 22 & 23 VICT. CAP. 35.

LAST DAY OF CLAIM.

London Gazette.—FRIDAY, Dec. 31.

BALL, JAMES, Orrell, near Wigan, Lancaster, Farmer. Feb 14. Barlow, Wigan
CAMMACK, FRANCIS, Stickney, Lincoln, Farmer. Jan 12. Walker & Co, Spilsby
CASE, JOHN, Dockhead, Bermondsey. Feb 28. Wellborne and Son, Duke st, Southwark
CHURCHILL, Rev. WILLIAM, Radipole, Dorset. Feb 19. Andrews & Co, Weymouth
COLLINS, THOMAS, Morton, Thornbury, Gloucester, Yeoman. Feb 2. Crossman & Lloyd, Thornbury
DAVY, JOHN, Yondover, Netherbury, Dorset, Yeoman. Feb 14. Leigh, Beaminster
DICKS, JOHN THOMAS, Brenchley, Kent, Esq. Jan 18. Blake & Co, College hill, Cannon st
EASTON, NATHANIEL, Kingston upon Hull, Esq. Feb 10. Leak & Co, Hull
FEITH, JOSEPH, Crabtree, Sheffield, Gent. Feb 1. Webster & Styring, Sheffield
GILBERT, Rev. PHILIP PARKER, Crefield rd, Ealing. Jan 31. Hughes, Edgware rd
HALL, ELIZA, Dartford, Kent. Feb 1. Miller & Co, Salters' Hall ct, Cannon st
HALL, MARIA ROBSON, Dartford, Kent. Feb 1. Miller & Co, Salters' Hall ct, Cannon st
HOLDEN, ANN, Bolton, Lancaster. Jan 26. Balshaw & Hodgkinson, Bolton
MAUNDER, WILLIAM ALBERT, Crediton, Devon, Butcher. Jan 20. Friend & Beal, Exeter
PARKINSON, RAWLINSON, Racquet ct, Fleet st, Architect. Jan 31. Nutt & Savery, Brabant ct, Philpot lane
PORTER, SAMUEL, Bury, Lancashire, Grocer. Jan 31. Grundy, Bury
RAINE, GEORGE TOWNSEND, Bootle, Liverpool, Gent. Feb 7. Lamb, Birkenhead
RAINE, WILLIAM MATTHEW, Sparkbrook, Birmingham, Gent. Feb 5. Fallows, Birmingham
REIF, JOHN CHARLES, Old Compton st, Soho, Licensed Victualler. Feb 1. Jerome & Co, Basinghall st
SAYER, JOHN, Old st, St Luke's, Fringe Manufacturer. Feb 12. Chamberlayne & Beaumont, Lincoln's inn fields
SEATON, JOSEPH, M.D., Halliford House, Sunbury. Jan 23. Haigh & Co, Liverpool
SIMPSON, JOHN, Leeds, Draper. Feb 15. Cranswick, Leeds
TEAGE, ELIZA ANNE, Court Hall, Kenton. Jan 20. Friend & Beal, Exeter
USBORNE, JOHN, Frittenden, Kent, Farmer. Jan 20. Hinds & Son, Goudhurst
UTHWATT, MARY, Southfield, Maidsmoreton, Bucks. Mar 1. Hearn & Co, Buckingham
WEBSTER, LEEMING, Germantown, Philadelphia, U.S.A., Manufacturer. Feb 15. Oates, Heckmondwike
WOOD, JOSEPH, Shay, Halifax, Gent. Feb 1. Wavell & Co, Halifax
WRIGHT, ROBERT, Hedon in Holderness, York, Gent. Leak & Co, Hull

London Gazette.—TUESDAY, Jan. 4.

AYRTON, the Right Hon ACTON SMEE, Courtfield gdns, Kensington. Feb 1. Valpy & Co, Lincoln's inn fields
BEARD, JOHN RALPH, Rottingdean, Sussex, Gent. Jan 15. Lewis, Lewes
BRAY, WILLIAM, Thurlstone, Penistone, York, Tallow Chandler. Feb 28. Dransfield & Hodgkinson, Penistone
CLEMENTS, ELIZABETH, Handsworth, Stafford. Feb 8. Hickman, Birmingham
COLE, ELIZA, Bamborough gdns, Shepherd's Bush. Jan 30. Coburn & Young, Leadenhall st
DRAKE, JOHN BATEMAN, Halifax, York, Contractor. March 1. Farrar, Halifax
DUNN, MONTAGU BUCCLEUCH, Bath, Esq. March 1. Lacey & Son, Bournemouth
EVANS, SAMUEL HARRISON, Landour, Weston super Mare, Esq, M.R.C.S. March 25. Robotham & Co, Derby
GRAHAM, DONALD DUNCAN, Effingham crescent, Dover. April 10. Davies, Sherborne lane, King William st
HAINSWORTH, JOHN THOMAS, Long Sutton, Lincoln, Retired Grocer. Jan 28. Mossop & Mossop, Long Sutton
HART, ELIZABETH, Stockton on Tees. Jan 23. Archer, Stockton on Tees
HART, NATHANIEL, Stockton on Tees, Tobacconist. Jan 23. Archer, Stockton on Tees.
HILL, JULIA, Paulton, Somerset. Feb 1. Cox & Kitson, Beaminster
HISCOCK, JOSEPH, Woodcutts, Dorset, Grocer. Feb 28. Pollard, Coleman st
JONES, ANTHONY, Weston super Mare, Fisherman. Jan 31. Baker & Co, Weston super Mare
LEAKE, HENRY, Forest hill, Kent, Hop Merchant. Feb 19. Micklem & Co, Gresham st
LOWE, JOHN, Sandiacre, Derby, Gent. March 7. Robotham & Co, Derby
LUCK, CORNELIUS, Leyton, Essex, Ship Carver. Jan 30. Davis, Liverpool st
MOUNTGARRETT, Right Hon FRANCES PENELOPE, Viscountess, South Audley st Feb 1. Evans & Co, Gray's inn sq
PAGE, JOHN FRANKS, Croydon, Surrey. Feb 19. Rowland & Co, Croydon
POWER, EDWARD RAWDON BINGHAM, Tenby, Pembroke, Esq. Jan 20. Look, Tenby
READER, HENRY BOTTEN, Brenchley, Kent, Farmer. Feb 1. Buss, Tunbridge Wells
REECE, SAMSON, Bayton common, Worcester, Brickmaker. March 1. Trow, Cleobury Mortimer
ROBINSON, SOPHIA AUGUSTA, Castle hill, Reading. Jan 22. Field, Reading
SWIRE, Rev FREDERICK, Elston, Nottingham. Feb 14. Ernest Langhorne, Wakefield
TOLLEMACHE, HENRY BENTIE, Exmouth, Devon, Esq. Feb 10. Hamilton, Exmouth
TUTTON, ANNE, Charlton, Henbury, Gloucester. Feb 14. Danger & Cartwright, Bristol
WATT, DOROTHY SNELL, Penally, nr Tenby, Pembroke. Jan 20. Look, Tenby
WHITAKER, THOMAS, Disley, Chester, Shopkeeper. Jan 22. Smith, Stockport

FER, TWO GUINEAS, for a sanitary inspection and report on a London dwelling house. Country surveys by arrangement. The Sanitary Engineering and Ventilation Company, 115, Victoria-street, Westminster. Prospectus free.—[ADVT.

FURNISH ON NORMAN & STACEY'S SYSTEM: No Deposit; 1, 2, or 3 years credit; 60 wholesale firms. Offices, 79, Queen Victoria-st., E.C. Branches at 121, Pall Mall, S.W., & 9, Liverpool-st., E.C. Goods delivered free.—[ADVT.

BANKRUPTCY NOTICES.

London Gazette.—FRIDAY, Dec. 31.

RECEIVING ORDERS.

ACKROYD, WALTER, Bradford, Fancy Stuff Manufacturer. Bradford. Pet Dec 24. Ord Dec 29
BRADBURY, DANIEL, Blackburn, Shuttle Spring Maker. Blackburn. Pet Dec 29. Ord Dec 29
CLIFFE, FERDINAND, Wilson st, Finsbury, Importer of Tobacconist's Goods. High Court. Pet Dec 23. Ord Dec 23
CORBYN, WILLIAM NAPIER, Usk, Mon, Farmer. Newport, Mon. Pet Dec 29. Ord Dec 29
CRACKNELL, ALFRED, Beckenham rd, Penge, Grocer. Croydon. Pet Dec 23. Ord Dec 23
CREASER, HENRY, and WILLIAM ECCLES, Skeldergate, Joiners. York. Pet Dec Dec 28. Ord Dec 29
DAVIES, RICHARD, Merthyr Tydfil, Butter Dealer. Merthyr Tydfil. Pet Dec 28. Ord Dec 29
DENNE, MARY ANN, Sebastopol, nr Panteg, Mon, Grocer. Newport, Mon. Pet Dec 24. Ord Dec 29
DRABBLE, ELIZA, ALFRED JOHN DRABBLE, WALTER HICKLING DRABBLE, and ARTHUR MADDOCK DRABBLE, Worksop, Nottinghamshire, Cabinet Makers. Sheffield. Pet Dec 29. Ord Dec 29
FIELD, JOHN, Bristol, Jeweller. Bristol. Pet Dec 29. Ord Dec 29
HAYWOOD, CHARLES F., Newington Causeway, A Managing Director of Daniel Haywood & Sons. High Court. Pet Dec 3. Ord Dec 24
HAYWOOD, DANIEL W. H., Newington Causeway, A Managing Director of Daniel Haywood & Sons. High Court. Pet Dec 3. Pet Dec 24
HEDGES, ELIZABETH ANN, Clifton, Bristol, Licensed Victualler. Bristol. Pet Dec 29. Ord Dec 29
HILL, JOHN DAVID, New Broad st, Naval Officer. High Court. Pet Nov 29. Ord Dec 23
HOLLINSHEAD, SOPHIA, Hatherton, nr Nantwich, Farmer. Nantwich and Crewe. Pet Dec 29. Ord Dec 29
HOOKER, ALFRED, Rye lane, Peckham, Importer of Buttons. High Court. Pet Dec 23. Ord Dec 23
KEAT, ADAM, Pelsall, Stafford, Beerhouse Keeper. Walsall. Pet Dec 29. Ord Dec 29
KENNAHAN, JOHN, Liverpool, Stationer. Liverpool. Pet Dec 29. Ord Dec 29
LANCASTER, JAMES MEANSFORTH, Pendleton, Lancashire, Butcher. Salford. Pet Dec 29. Ord Dec 29
LANE, ROBERT GARWOOD, Gorleston, Suffolk, Boat Owner. Gt Yarmouth. Pet Dec 29. Ord Dec 29
MACKENZIE, J J, Langham st, Gent. High Court. Pet Nov 27. Ord Dec 28
MANSHIP, JOHN BISHOP, Gt Yarmouth, Fishing Boat Owner. Gt Yarmouth. Pet Dec 29. Ord Dec 29
MONTGOMERY, PHILLIPS HOWARD, Tonbridge, Clerk in Holy Orders. Tonbridge Wells. Pet Dec 29. Ord Dec 29
MORRIS, WILLIAM HENRY, Landport, Hampshire, Grocer. Portsmouth. Pet Dec 23 Ord Dec 23
NUTTALL, JAMES, Rochdale, Tin Plate Worker. Oldham. Pet Dec 23. Ord Dec 23
SHAW, SAMUEL, jun, Ilkeston, Derby, Grocer. Derby. Pet Dec 23. Ord Dec 29
SHEFFIELD, JOHN, Beswick, nr Manchester, Slipper Manufacturer. Manchester. Pet Dec 29. Ord Dec 29
SOLOMON, ROSETTA, Ellington st, Barnsbury, Widow. High Court. Pet Dec 7. Ord Dec 24
STONE, EDWARD, Charterhouse sq. High Court. Pet Dec 3. Ord Dec 23
UNWIN, JOHN, Landbeach, Cambridge, Builder. Cambridge. Pet Dec 29. Ord Dec 29
UPWARD, WALTER, Finsbury circus, Solicitor. High Court. Pet Nov 15. Ord Dec 23
VERDIN, ALBERT, Blackfriars rd, Licensed Victualler. High Court. Pet Dec 21. Ord Dec 24
WHEATLEY, JOHN, Hucknall Torkard, Nottingham, Coal Miner. Nottingham. Pet Dec 29. Ord Dec 29
WILDERSPIN, ISAAC, Elsworth, Cambridge, Implement Maker. Cambridge. Pet Dec 29. Ord Dec 29
WILLIAMS, HENRY DAVIDS BAYLEY, Carnarvon. Bangor. Pet Dec 13. Ord Dec 29
The following amended notice is substituted for that published in the London Gazette of Dec 21.
THOMAS, JOSIAH, and JOHN JOHN, Llangennech, Carmarthen, Timber Merchants. Carmarthen. Pet Dec 4. Ord Dec 16

FIRST MEETINGS.

BAYNHAM, JAMES, Hereford, Seedsman. Jan 7 at 10.15. 2, Offa st, Hereford
BELCHER, HENRY, and GEORGE BELCHER, Gloucester, Enamelled Slate Manufacturers. Jan 8 at 3. Bell Hotel, Gloucester
BROOKS, EDWARD, East Grinstead, Builder's Foreman. Jan 10 at 12. Off Rec, 4, Pavilion bldgs, Brighton
CARTER, JOHN MONEY, Linden gdns, Chiswick, Retired Colonel in Army. Jan 7 at 11. 28 and 29, St Swithin's lane
COLMAN, ELIZABETH, Stoke Ash, Suffolk, Farmer. Jan 8 at 12.45. Off Rec, 2, Westgate st, Ipswich

CORBYN, WILLIAM NAPIER, Ask, Mon, Farmer. Jan 12 at 12.30. 12, Tredegar pl, Newport, Mon
CREASER, HENRY, and WILLIAM ECCLES, York, Joiners. Jan 11 at 12. Off Rec, York
CROSBIE, CHARLES, Sheffield, Draper. Jan 10 at 11.30. Off Rec, Figtree lane, Sheffield
DEANE, MARY ANN, Sebastopol, nr Panteg, Mon, Grocer. Jan 12 at 12. 12, Tredegar pl, Newport, Mon
DRUMMOND, JOHN NELSON, Kingston hill, Artist. Jan 7 at 12. 28 and 29, St Swithin's lane
FARMER, JOHN, Farringdon rd, Baker. Jan 7 at 11. 33, Carey st, Lincoln's inn
FOULKES, JOHN, Rhyl, Flint, Timber Merchant. Jan 11 at 12. Off Rec, Chester
HAMBROUGH, DUDLEY ALBERT, Ventnor, I.W., Gent. Jan 12 at 1.30. Chamber of Commerce, 145, Cheapside
HARDSTONE, WILLIAM, High rd, Lee, Butcher. Jan 12 at 3. 109, Victoria st, Westminster
HAWKE, W H, St Mary Axe, Telegraph Codist. Jan 7 at 12. 33, Carey st, Lincoln's inn
HAYWARD, CHARLES JOHN ERNEST, Southsea, Gent. Jan 17 at 3. 166, Queen st, Portsea
HUNT, MARY COLE, Springfield, Essex, Schoolmistress. Jan 10 at 10. Shirehall, Chelmsford
MILLINGTON, JOHN, Stoke Newington rd, Draper. Jan 7 at 12. Bankruptcy bldgs, Portugal st, Lincoln's inn
MORRIS, WILLIAM HENRY, Landport, Hampshire, Grocer. Jan 17 at 4. 166, Queen st, Portsea
NUTTALL, JAMES, Rochdale, Tin Plate Worker. Jan 10 at 3.30. Townhall, Rochdale
OXLEY, JOHN, Mansfield, Nottinghamshire, Fruit Merchant. Jan 7 at 11. Off Rec, 1, High pavement, Nottingham
PARSONS, JAMES HERBERT, and MARGARET PARSONS, Fulham rd, Fulham, Draper. Jan 7 at 11. Bankruptcy bldgs, Portugal st, Lincoln's inn
PHILLIPS, HENRY, Illogan, Cornwall, Butcher. Jan 7 at 12.30. Tabb's Hotel, Redruth
POWELL, THOMAS, Gloucester, Grocer. Jan 8 at 12. Off Rec, King st, Gloucester
RAWLIN, WILLIAM, Newark upon Trent, Watchmaker. Jan 7 at 12. Off Rec, 1, High pavement, Nottingham
SAGE, RICHARD, Swilland, Suffolk, Butcher. Jan 8 at 12.15. Off Rec, 2, Westgate st, Ipswich
SWAFFER, JOHN, Edenbridge, Kent, Grocer. Jan 7 at 2.30. Spencer and Reeves, Mount Pleasant, Tunbridge Wells
THOMPSON, EMMA AMELIA, Broadstairs, Schoolmistress. Jan 14 at 10. St George's st, Canterbury
UNWIN, JOHN, Landbeach, Cambridgeshire, Builder. Jan 11 at 12. Off Rec, 5, Petty Cury, Cambridge
WATSON, GEORGE, Nottingham, Provision Dealer. Jan 7 at 3.30. Off Rec, 1, High pavement, Nottingham
WILDERSPIN, ISAAC, Elsworth, Cambridgeshire, Implement Maker. Jan 14 at 12.30. Off Rec, 5, Petty Cury, Cambridge
WILSON, WILLIAM, Leadenhall st, Insurance Broker. Jan 7 at 11. 33, Carey st, Lincoln's inn
WRENN, SIDNEY WILLIAM, Rotherham, Coach Builder. Jan 10 at 12.30. Off Rec, Fig Tree lane, Sheffield

ADJUDICATIONS.

ACKROYD, WALTER, Bradford, Fancy Stuff Maker. Bradford. Pet Dec 24. Ord Dec 29
ARMSTRONG, CHARLES, Kingstown, nr Carlisle, Brickmaker. Carlisle. Pet Dec 11. Ord Dec 29
BAINES, JOHN, Nottingham, Joiner. Nottingham. Pet Dec 18. Ord Dec 29
BENNETT, WILLIAM HENRY, Gibraltar terr, New rd, Chatham, Grocer. Rochester. Pet Dec 8. Ord Dec 29
BRADBURY, DANIEL, Blackburn, Shuttle Spring Maker. Blackburn. Pet Dec 29. Ord Dec 29
COLEBROOKE, GEORGE, Stratford, Essex, Clothier. High Court. Pet Nov 20. Ord Dec 24
CREASER, HENRY, and WILLIAM ECCLES, York, Joiners. York. Pet Dec 28. Ord Dec 29
DUNGEY, JOHN, Leytonstone, Essex, Timber Merchant. High Court. Pet Nov 18. Ord Dec 28
FARMER, JOHN, Farringdon rd, Baker. High Court. Pet Nov 27. Ord Dec 24
FRAMPTON, BRICE GRAHAM, Lordshippk, Stoke Newington, Lathwood Merchant. High Court. Pet Nov 26. Ord Dec 24
GROVES, WILLIAM POTTER, Nottingham, Tailor. Nottingham. Pet Dec 8. Ord Dec 28
HAWKE, W H, St Mary Axe, Telegraph Codist. High Court. Pet Nov 19. Ord Dec 24
LANCASTER, JAMES MEANSFORTH, Pendleton, Lancs, Butcher. Salford. Pet Dec 23. Ord Dec 28
LANE, ROBERT GARWOOD, Gorleston, Suffolk, Boat Owner. Gt Yarmouth. Pet Dec 29. Ord Dec 29
MANSKIP, JOHN BISHOP, Gt Yarmouth, Fishing Boat Owner. Gt Yarmouth. Pet Dec 29. Ord Dec 29
MASON, HENRY, Jamaica rd, Bermondsey, Confectioner. High Court. Pet Oct 25. Ord Dec 28
MINISTER, EDWARD WILLIAM, Argyle pl, Regent st. High Court. Pet Nov 22. Ord Dec 24
MORRIS, WILLIAM HENRY, Landport, Hants, Grocer. Portsmouth. Pet Dec 23. Ord Dec 28
NIBLETT, SAMUEL, Cheltenham, Baker. Cheltenham. Pet Dec 20. Ord Dec 29
PICKERING, RICHARD, Hawarden, Farmer. Chester. Pet Dec 7. Ord Dec 28
SEYMOUR, W., residence unknown. High Court. Pet Mar 11. Ord Dec 29
SHEFFIELD, JOHN, Beswick, nr Manchester, Slipper Manufacturer. Manchester. Pet Dec 29. Ord Dec 29
SMOOTHY, ALBERT THOMAS BUCK, Hitchin, Herts, out of business. Luton. Pet Dec 22. Ord Dec 29
SOWERBUTTS, WILLIAM FREDERICK, Hanbury st, Commercial st, Walking Stick Manufacturer. High Court. Pet Nov 27. Ord Dec 28
THOMAS, JOSIAH, and JOHN JOHN, Llangennech, Carmarthenshire, Timber Merchants. Carmarthen. Pet Dec 4. Ord Dec 29
VERDIN, ALBERT, Blackfriars rd, Licensed Victualler. High Court. Pet Dec 24. Ord Dec 24
WARREN, JOHN PEARSON, Stuchbury, Northamptonshire, Farmer. Banbury. Pet Dec 16. Ord Dec 29
WAUGH, JAMES, Steele's rd, Hampstead, Corn Factor. High Court. Pet July 22. Ord Dec 28
WHEATLEY, JOHN, Bucknall Torkard, Nottinghamshire, Coal Miner. Nottingham. Pet Dec 29. Ord Dec 29
WILLIAMS, CONYNGHAM OGILVIE, Leeds, Schoolmaster. Leeds. Pet Dec 16. Ord Dec 29

The following Amended Notice is substituted for that published in the London Gazette, Dec. 28.

CARTER, JOHN MONEY, Linden gdns, Chiswick, Retired Colonel in Army. Brentford Pet Sept 17. Ord. Dec 21

London Gazette.—TUESDAY, Jan. 4.

RECEIVING ORDERS.

ATTWOOD, WILLIAM HENRY, Kensworth, Hertfordshire, Farmer. Luton. Pet Dec 21. Ord Dec 30
BATES, ELIZA, and CHARLES BATES, Worcester, Baker. Worcester. Pet Dec 31. Ord Dec 31
BOOTH, JAMES, Padiham, Lancashire, Grocer. Burnley. Pet Dec 30. Ord Dec 30
BROOKES, THOMAS, Wrexham, Denbighshire, Brewer. Wrexham. Pet Dec 29. Ord Dec 29
BURDETT, GEORGE EDWARD HUNT, Westow st, Upper Norwood, Printer. Greenwich. Pet Dec 31. Ord Dec 31
BUSH, CHARLES, and HENRY SOWTER, Bristol, Booksellers. Bristol. Pet Dec 15. Ord Dec 30
CLIFFE, JAMES COVERDALE, Kingston upon Hull, Sewing Machine Agent. Kingston upon Hull. Pet Dec 30. Ord Dec 30
COOPER, ROBERT, Nottingham, Grocer. Nottingham. Pet Dec 30. Ord Dec 30
COULTON, HENRY, Newport Pagnell, Buckinghamshire, Clerk. Northampton. Pet Dec 30. Ord Dec 30
CULVERHOUSE, ALFRED, and FREDERICK HENRY CULVERHOUSE, Purfleet Wharf, Camden Town, Contractors. High Court. Pet Dec 29. Ord Dec 29
DAVIES, JOHN, Torrington, Devon, Dairyman. Barnstaple. Pet Dec 31. Ord Dec 31
DEBIERRE, CAMILLE, Stourport, Worcestershire, Bookseller. Kidderminster. Pet Dec 20. Ord Dec 30
ELLIS, JAMES HENRY, Greenside, Pudsey, Confectioner. Bradford. Pet Dec 30. Ord Dec 30
FOX, JOSEPH, Whitstable, Compositor. Canterbury. Pet Dec 28. Ord Dec 29
GOLDSMITH, ABRAHAM, Mildmay park, Canonbury, Schoolmaster. High Court. Pet Dec 30. Ord Dec 30
GOULD, ALFRED, Lincoln, Provision Dealer. Lincoln. Pet Dec 31. Ord Dec 31
HANNAN, FRANCIS JOHN, Woodstock, Oxfordshire, Doctor. Oxford. Pet Dec 29. Ord Dec 29
HERBERT, JOSEPH, Hastings, Lodging house keeper. Hastings. Pet Dec 29. Ord Dec 29
HOLMES, RICHARD, Bardsey, Yorks, Innkeeper. York. Pet Dec 31. Ord Dec 31
MARSHALL, ROBERT, Kingston upon Hull, Fish Merchant. Kingston upon Hull. Pet Dec 31. Ord Dec 31
MARTIN, GEORGE, jun, Bowles rd, Old Kent rd, Stone Merchant. High Court. Pet Dec 30. Ord Dec 30
MUNDIE, GEORGE, Canterbury, Surgeon. Canterbury. Pet Dec 31. Ord Dec 31
PAYNE, ELON, Blaenavon, Mon, Grocer. Tredegar. Pet Dec 29. Ord Dec 30
PEACOCK, ROBERT MARK, Kingsland rd, Manager of a Tobacco Manufactory. High Court. Pet Dec 30. Ord Dec 30
SMITH, WILLIAM, Milton ct rd, New Cross, Deptford, Mason. Greenwich. Pet Dec 21. Ord Dec 31
TRENT, HERBERT ROBERT, Dorchester, Baker. Dorchester. Pet Dec 30. Ord Dec 30
UPJOHN, AMBROSE G, Brighton, Merchant. Brighton. Ord Dec 30
WELSMAN, GEORGE EDWIN, Fenchurch st. High Court. Pet Nov 5. Ord Dec 30
WILCOX, ALFRED, Birmingham, Jeweller. Birmingham. Pet Dec 30. Ord Dec 30

RECEIVING ORDER RESCINDED AND ADJUDICATION ANNULLED.

HUNT, ROBERT, Charles st, St James's, Gent. High Court. Receiv Ord Mar 24. Adjud May 25. Resc and Annul Dec 31

FIRST MEETINGS.

ACKROYD, WALTER, Bradford, Fancy Stuff Manufacturer. Jan 12 at 11. Off Rec, 31, Manor row, Bradford
ADAMS, JOHN, Bridgend, Glamorgan, Draper. Jan 13 at 12. Off Rec, 3, Crockherbtown, Cardiff
ASKIN, JOHN FREDERICK PASS, Sheffield, Grocer. Jan 12 at 12. Off Rec, Figtree lane, Sheffield
ATTWOOD, WILLIAM HENRY, Kensworth, Herts, Farmer. Jan 13 at 11. Off Rec, 29, Park st West, Luton, Beds
AYLMER, Captain JOHN EVANS FREKE, Cannon st, Engineer. Jan 11 at 12. Bankruptcy bldgs, Portugal st, Lincoln's inn fields
BATES, ELIZA, and CHARLES BATES, Worcester, Baker. Jan 14 at 11. Off Rec, Worcester
BEDFORD, THOMAS PERCY, and PERCY ROBERTS IMPEY, Wormwood st, Carpet Dealers. Jan 11 at 11. Bankruptcy bldgs, Portugal st, Lincoln's inn fields
BRADBURY, DANIEL, Blackburn, Shuttle Spring Maker. Jan 12 at 2.30. County Court, Blackburn
BROOKER, MARK, Hollydale rd, Peckham, Grocer. Jan 13 at 11. 33, Carey st, Lincoln's inn
BUSH, CHARLES, and HENRY SOWTER, Bristol, Booksellers. Jan 17 at 12.30. Off Rec, Bank chmbrs, Bristol
CLAYTON, MARY ANN, Leeds, Confectioner. Jan 12 at 11. Off Rec, 29, Park row, Leeds
CRICHTON, ALEXANDER, Sheffield, Designer. Jan 12 at 11. 33, Carey st, Lincoln's inn
DAINTON, ARTHUR HENRY, Wood st, Westminster, Oilman. Jan 12 at 2.30. Bankruptcy bldgs, Lincoln's inn fields
DAVIES, RICHARD, Merthyr Tydfil, Butter Dealer. Jan 12 at 3. Off Rec, Merthyr Tydfil
ELLIS, JAMES HENRY, Pudsey, Yorks, Confectioner. Jan 13 at 11. Off Rec, 31, Manor row, Bradford
FIELD, JOHN, Bristol, Jeweller. Jan 12 at 12.30. Off Rec, Bank chbrs, Bristol
FOX, JOSEPH, Whitstable, Kent, Compositor. Jan 12 at 11.30. 33, St George's st, Canterbury
FRANK, EDWARD, Redcross st, Goods Importer. Jan 12 at 11. Bankruptcy bldngs, Portugal st, Lincoln's inn fields
GIBBS, THOMAS JAMES, and ALFRED IMBER, North hill, Highgate, Builders. Jan 13 at 2.30. 33, Carey st, Lincoln's inn
HAWORTH, RICHARD, Blackburn, Draper. Jan 12 at 9. County court, Blackburn
HEDGES, ELIZABETH ANN, Clifton, Bristol, Licensed Victualler. Jan 12 at 1. Off Rec, Bank chbrs, Bristol
HERBERT, JOSEPH, Hastings, Lodging house Keeper. Jan 12 at 2. Gausden & Dawson, Robertson st, Hastings
HERBERT, WILLIAM GRIFFITHS, Penygraig, Glamorganshire, Draper. Jan 12 at 12. Off Rec, Merthyr Tydfil
HOLMES, RICHARD, Bardsey, Yorks, Innkeeper and Farmer. Jan 13 at 3. Off Rec, York
HUTCHINS, JOHN THOMAS, High st, Stratford, Clothier. Jan 13 at 12. 33, Carey st, Lincoln's inn
JAMES, THOMAS JOHN, Penarth, Glamorgan, Builder. Jan 13 at 2.30. Off Rec, 3, Crockherbtown, Cardiff
JELKS, WILLIAM, Holloway rd, Furniture Dealer. Jan 11 at 12. 33 Carey st, Lincoln's inn

KEAY, ADAM, Pelsall, Stafford, Beerhouse Keeper. Jan 19 at 12. Off Rec, Walsall
LANCASTER, JAMES MEANSFORTH, Pendleton, Lancashire, Butcher. Jan 11 at 11.30. Off Rec, Ogden's chbrs, Bridge st, Manchester
LANE, ROBERT GARWOOD, Gorleston, Suffolk, Boat Owner. Jan 14 at 10.15. Lovewell Blake, South Quay, Gt Yarmouth
LAW, MONTAGUE WILLIAM, Victoria st, Westminster, Iron Building Contractor. Jan 12 at 12. 33, Carey st, Lincoln's inn
LOE, GEORGE JAMES, Margate, Architect. Jan 13 at 12. Bankruptcy bldgs, Lincoln's inn
MADDOCK, JONATHAN, Pontycymmer, Glamorgan, Butcher. Jan 13 at 11. Off Rec, 8, Crockherbtown, Cardiff
MANSHIP, JOHN BISHOP, Gt Yarmouth, Fishing Boat Owner. Jan 14 at 10.30. Lovewell Blake, South Quay, Gt Yarmouth
MUNDIE, GEORGE, Wincheap, Canterbury, Surgeon. Jan 13 at 1. Bankruptcy bldgs, Lincoln's inn
OUTTEN, JOHN ALFRED, Carlton rd, Mile End, out of business. Jan 12 at 2.30. 33, Carey st, Lincoln's inn
PROSTORSKI, MORRIS, Sheffield, Mineral Water Manufacturer. Jan 13 at 11. Off Rec, Figtree lane, Sheffield
RODDA, HORACE GUSTAVUS, and FRANK DECIMUS RODDA, St Leonards on Sea, Builders. Jan 11 at 12. Bankruptcy bldgs, Portugal st, Lincoln's inn fields
SENIOR, BENJAMIN, Hanging Heaton, nr Dewsbury, Farmer. Jan 11 at 10. Off Rec, Bank chbrs, Batley
SHAW, SAMUEL, jun, Ilkeston, Derby, Grocer. Jan 12 at 3. Flying Horse Hotel, Nottingham
SMITH, ALFRED HODGSON, Nottingham, Brass Engineer. Jan 11 at 11. Off Rec, 1, High pavement, Nottingham
SMITH, ATKIN, St George's st East, Builder. Jan 13 at 11. Bankruptcy bldgs, Portugal st, Lincoln's inn fields
SMOOTHY, ALBERT THOMAS BUCK, Hitchin, Herts, out of business. Jan 14 at 12. Sun Hotel, Hitchin, Herts
SQUIRES, FREDERICK, Nottingham, Painter. Jan 11 at 12. Off Rec, 1, High pavement, Nottingham
STEEDS, JAMES, Gloucester, Licensed Victualler. Jan 11 at 3. Off Rec, Gloucester
TERNT, HERBERT ROBERT, Fordington, Dorsetshire, Baker. Jan 12 at 12.15. Antelope Hotel, Dorchester
ULRICI, JOHANN EBERHARD FRIEDRICH, Tower Hill, Ship Chandler. Jan 11 at 2.30. Bankruptcy bldngs, Portugal st, Lincoln's inn fields
WARREN, JOHN PEARSON, Stuchbury, Northamptonshire, Farmer. Jan 13 at 12. Off Rec, 1, St Aldates, Oxford
WILLEY, WALTER, Leeds, Ironmonger. Jan 18 at 1. Off Rec, Figtree lane, Sheffield

The following amended notices are substituted for those published in the London Gazette of Dec. 28.

BAINES, JOHN, Nottingham, Joiner. Jan 5 at 3.30. Off Rec, High pavement, Nottingham
NIBLETT, SAMUEL, Cheltenham, Baker. Jan 4 at 3.30. County Court, Cheltenham

ADJUDICATIONS.

BALMER, PETER, Aughton, nr Ormskirk, Lancs, Architect. Liverpool. Pet Nov 27. Ord Dec 31
BEDFORD, THOMAS PERCY, and PERCY ROBERTS IMPEY, Wormwood chbrs, Wormwood st, Carpet Dealers. High Court. Pet Aug 21. Ord Jan 3
BELCHER, HENRY, and GEORGE BELCHER, Glos, Slate Manufacturers. Gloucester. Pet Dec 20. Ord Jan 1
BLAKE, JOB, St. Helen's, Glass Dealer. Liverpool. Pet Dec 9. Ord Dec 30
BOOTH, JAMES, Padiham, Lancs, Grocer. Burnley. Pet Dec 30. Ord Jan 1
BUTCHER, CHARLES, Long Melford, Suffolk, Maltster. Colchester. Pet Dec 16. Ord Dec 31
CHAPMAN, GEORGE, and JAMES WATTS, Stockport, Cheshire, Drapers. Stockport. Pet Nov 30. Ord Dec 31
COOPER, WILLIAM, Rainow, nr Macclesfield, Farmer. Macclesfield. Pet Dec 2. Ord Dec 30
COULTON, HENRY, Newport Pagnell, Buckingham, Clerk. Northampton. Pet Dec 30. Ord Dec 30
DAVIES, RICHARD, Merthyr Tydfil, Butter Dealer. Merthyr Tydfil. Pet Dec 20. Ord Dec 31
DERIERRE, CAMILLE, Stourport, Worcester, Bookseller. Kidderminster. Pet Dec 20. Ord Dec 31
DENNE, MARY ANN, Sebastopol, nr Panteg, Mon, Grocer. Newport, Mon. Pet Dec 24. Ord Dec 30
DICKINSON, THOMAS, North Shields, Fruiterer. Newcastle on Tyne. Pet Dec 16. Ord Dec 31
ELLIS, JAMES HENRY, Pudsey, Yorks, Confectioner. Bradford. Pet Dec 20. Ord Dec 30
FOX, JOSEPH, Whitstable, Compositor. Canterbury. Pet Dec 23. Ord Dec 29
GOULD, ALFRED, Lincoln, Provision Dealer. Lincoln. Pet Dec 31. Ord Dec 31
GROUCOTT, WILLIAM, Nantwich, Cabinet Maker. Nantwich and Crewe. Pet Dec 16. Ord Dec 30
HERBERT, JOSEPH, Hastings, Lodging house Keeper. Hastings. Pet Dec 29. Ord Dec 29
HOLLINSHEAD, SOPHIA, Hatherton, nr Nantwich, Farmer. Nantwich and Crewe. Pet Dec 29. Ord Dec 30
HOOKER, ALFRED, Rye lane, Peckham, Importer of Buttons. High Court. Pet Dec 23. Ord Dec 30
HUNTABLE, ARTHUR, Ilfracombe, Wine Merchant. Barnstaple. Pet Dec 11. Ord Dec 30
KING, GEORGE WILLIAM, Keen's yd, St Paul's rd, Canonbury, Cab Proprietor. High Court. Pet Dec 18. Ord Dec 30
LOE, GEORGE JAMES, Margate, Architect. Canterbury. Pet Dec 2. Ord Dec 31
LONGNEY, ARTHUR, Cheltenham, Grocer. Cheltenham. Pet Dec 2. Ord Dec 30
MUNDIE, GEORGE, Wincheap, Canterbury, Surgeon. Canterbury. Pet Dec 31. Ord Dec 31
OXLEY, JOHN, Mansfield, Nottingham, Fruit Merchant. Nottingham. Pet Dec 21. Ord Dec 30
PIKE, THOMAS, Luton, Grocer. Luton. Pet Dec 17. Ord Jan 1
POWELL, GEORGE, and SARAH POWELL, Binsted, Hants, Farmers. Winchester. Pet Dec 4. Ord Dec 31
SENIOR, BENJAMIN, Hanging Heaton, nr Dewsbury, Farmer. Dewsbury. Pet Dec 10. Ord Dec 31
SMITH, WILLIAM, New Cross, Deptford, Mason. Greenwich. Pet Dec 31. Ord Dec 31
SOLOMON, ROSETTA, Ellingson st, Barnsbury, Widow. High Court. Pet Dec 7. Ord Dec 30
SQUIRES, FREDERICK, Nottingham, Painter. Nottingham. Pet Dec 22. Ord Dec 30
STEEDS, JAMES, Gloucester, Licensed Victualler, Gloucester. Pet Dec 28. Ord Jan 1
STYLES, JOHN, Chiddingly, Sussex, Farmer. Lewes and Eastbourne. Pet Nov 27. Ord Dec 31
SWAFFER, JOHN, Edenbridge, Kent, Grocer. Tunbridge Wells. Pet Nov 29. Ord Dec 31
UNWIN, JOHN, Cottenham, now Landbeach, Cambridgeshire, Builder. Cambridge. Pet Dec 29. Ord Dec 29
WHITE, DAVID, Eastrop, nr Basingstoke, Auctioneer. Winchester. Pet Dec 13. Ord Dec 31
WILDERSPIN, ISAAC, Elsworth, Cambridgeshire, Implement Maker. Cambridge. Pet Dec 29. Ord Dec 29

BIRTHS, MARRIAGES, AND DEATHS.

BIRTHS.

BOYD.—Dec. 30, at 4, Sussex-gardens, W., the wife of Archibald H. Boyd, Esq., barrister-at-law, of a son, stillborn.
CLIFFORD.—Dec. 31, at 41, Killicoat-avenue, Streatham-hill, the wife of Philip H. Clifford, barrister-at-law, of a daughter.
WALTON.—Dec. 24, at 11, Montagu-square, W., the wife of Joseph Walton, barrister-at-law, of a daughter.

DEATH.

PEACOCK.—Jan. 2, at 3, Stanhope-street, Hyde-park-gardens, Robert William Peacock, second solicitor to the General Post Office, aged 82.

The Subscription to the SOLICITORS' JOURNAL *is—Town*, 26s. 6d.; *Country*, 28s. 6d.; *with the* WEEKLY REPORTER, 52s. *Payment in advance includes Double Numbers and Postage. Subscribers can have their Volumes bound at the office—cloth*, 2s. 6d., *half law calf*, 5s. 6d.

CONTENTS.

CURRENT TOPICS 163
EASEMENTS ATTACHED TO THE REVERSION 164
UNQUALIFIED PERSONS 166
SOME RECENT PRACTICE DECISIONS 167
REVIEWS 167
CORRESPONDENCE 169
LAW SOCIETIES 169
LEGAL NEWS 169
COURT PAPERS 170
WINDING-UP NOTICES 174
CREDITORS' NOTICES 176
BANKRUPTCY NOTICES 176

All letters intended for publication in the "Solicitors' Journal" must be authenticated by the name of the writer.

Where difficulty is experienced in procuring the Journal with regularity, in the Country, it is requested that application be made direct to the Publisher.

SCHWEITZER'S COCOATINA

Anti-Dyspeptic Cocoa or Chocolate Powder.
Guaranteed Pure Soluble Cocoa of the Finest Quality with the excess of fat extracted.
The Faculty pronounce it "the most nutritious, perfectly digestible beverage for Breakfast, Luncheon, or Supper, and invaluable for Invalids and Children."
Highly commended by the entire Medical Press.
Being without sugar, spice, or other admixture, it suits all palates, keeps for years in all climates, and is four times the strength of cocoas THICKENED yet WEAKENED with starch, &c., and IN REALITY CHEAPER than such Mixtures.
Made instantaneously with boiling water, a teaspoonful to a Breakfast Cup, costing less than a halfpenny.
COCOATINA A LA VANILLE is the most delicate, digestible, cheapest Manilla Chocolate, and may be taken when richer chocolate is prohibited.
In tins at 1s. 6d., 3s., 5s. 6d., &c., by Chemists and Grocers.
Charities on Special Terms by the Sole Proprietor, H. SCHWEITZER & Co., 10, Adam-st., Strand, London, W.C.

EDE AND SON,

ROBE MAKERS,

BY SPECIAL APPOINTMENT,

To Her Majesty, the Lord Chancellor, the Whole of the Judicial Bench, Corporation of London, &c.

ROBES FOR QUEEN'S COUNSEL AND BARRISTERS.

SOLICITORS' GOWNS.

Law Wigs and Gowns for Registrars, Town Clerks, and Clerks of the Peace.

CORPORATION ROBES, UNIVERSITY AND CLERGY GOWNS

ESTABLISHED 1689.

94 CHANCERY LANE LONDON

UNTEARABLE LETTER COPYING BOOKS.

(HOWARD'S PATENT.)

1 000 Leaf Book, 5s. 6d.; 500 Leaf Book, 3s. 6d. English made.

THE BEST LETTER COPYING BOOK OUT.

WODDERSPOON & CO.,

7, SERLE STREET, AND 1, PORTUGAL STREET, LINCOLN'S INN, W.C.

ESTABLISHED 1869.

THE ACADEMY,

A Weekly Review of Literature, Science, and Art.

PRICE THREEPENCE: FREE BY POST THREEPENCE-HALFPENNY.

ANNUAL SUBSCRIPTION, 13s.; BY POST, 15s. 2d.

PAYABLE IN ADVANCE.

PUBLISHED EVERY FRIDAY IN TIME FOR THAT DAY'S POST.

CONTAINING EVERY WEEK

SIGNED REVIEWS of important new books, English and Foreign, in Belles-Lettres, Travel, History, Biography, Philosophy, Natural Science, Philology, the Fine Arts, and Archæology. PERIODICAL NEWS-LETTERS from Oxford, Cambridge, Paris, Rome, Florence, Berlin, and other Centres of Learning and Literary Activity.

Obituaries of Distinguished Men. Transactions of Learned Societies. Correspondence.

Notes and News, Literary, Geographical, Scientific, and Artistic. Jottings respecting rare Books, Sales, and Curiosities. Publishers' Announcements, &c.

Notices of Exhibitions in London and the Provinces, and of important Novelties in Music and the Drama. ORIGINAL ARTICLES on Current Topics of Literary Interest.

THE ACADEMY *has always maintained the principle of* Signed Articles *as affording the best guarantee of fairness and competence. In the list of its Contributors will be found the recognized Authorities in their several departments of Knowledge. The half-yearly Volumes are of permanent value for purposes of Reference, especially to those interested in the English Classics, in History, Philology, and Oriental Studies.*

A New Volume commenced on January 1, 1887.

PUBLISHING OFFICE:

27, CHANCERY LANE, W.C.

To be had at all Railway Stations, and of all Newsvendors in Town and Country.

A SPECIMEN NUMBER

Sent to any part of the United Kingdom on receipt of Threepence-Halfpenny in postage stamps.

SCALE OF CHARGES FOR ADVERTISING IN "THE ACADEMY."

Five Lines of Small Type	0	2	6	A Column	3 0 0
Every additional Line	0	0	6	A Page (equivalent to Three Columns)	8 8 0
Half a Column	1	10	0		

SPECIAL ARRANGEMENTS FOR A SERIES.

Advertisements should be sent to the Publisher, H. Villers, at the Office, 27, Chancery-lane, W.C., on or before the Wednesday previous to the Saturday on which they are intended to appear.

*** *"THE ACADEMY" is a desirable medium for all Advertisements addressed to the educated classes.*